

With the author's last complement.
MAHOMEDANISM.

BY
BASANTA COOMAR BOSE, M.A., B.L.,
Advocate, High Court, Calcutta, Author of
Conquest of Bengal, Hindu Customs
in Bengal, and Christianity,
A Critical Study.

PUBLISHED BY
THE BOOK CO., Ltd.
College Square, Calcutta.
1931.

Printed by—B. N. Sircar,
AT THE
ANANDA MOHAN PRESS,
88. *Asutosh Mookherjee Road, Bhowanipur.*

PREFACE.

Two years ago, when I was past seventy eight years of age, I published my work on Christianity. Today I publish my work on Mahomedanism. The reader will pardon all defects in this book considering my extreme old age and my partial blindness.

I have tried to be strictly impartial as I have no bias for or against any religion and I have highly praised Mahomed where praise was due to him and I have written a chapter comparing the religion of Christ with that of Mahomed.

I have cited authority with chapter and verse for almost every statement I have made in this book, and I have given many parallels and many illustrations from the four living religions, two born in India and two born in Judea.

At the end of this book the reader will find a complete Index to the Koran giving the numbers of the chapter and of the verse, the substance of important verses being briefly stated.

I must here declare that unless otherwise stated, all references to Christians and Mahomedans will be understood to refer to people resident out of India, as the law regarding communal matters is in a somewhat dangerous state.

I request all Mahomedan readers not to pass a verdict on this book without reading the last chapter.

Calcutta,
1931.

BASANTA COOMAR BOSE.

religion that it shall enable him to do that which he can already do without it. The test of a true religion is that it shall enable a man to do the impossible and the author of "Christianity: A Critical Study", must write another book and explain how hundreds of thousands of lives have been enabled to exhibit qualities manifestly beyond the reach of unaided human faculties. The book is interesting in showing that no reverence, however devout, can win India for Christ and Christianity. The only power that can do that is the power of the Resurrection seen in the lives of His professed followers. If Mr. Bose has not succeeded in proving his case he has, at least, issued a challenge which should give all professing Christians furiously to think. "The Englishman" 8th July, 1929.

Gore	New Commentary on Scripture.
Gosenius	Hebrew Lexicon.
Hallam	Middle Ages.
"	Constitutional History.
Haug	Aiterya Brahmana.
Hume	Essay on Miracles.
Illingworth	Trinity.
Irenaeus	Against Heretics.
Johnson	Rise of Christendom.
Josephus	Antiquities.
Jacob ben Chajain, Rabbi	Introduction to Rabbinical Bible.
Kain	Jesus of Nazara.
Kasimira	
Khasita	
Koran	
Kurtz	Colenso.
Kwan Yin	
Laplace	Celestial Heavens.
Lingard	History of England.
Macauley	Essays.
Mahabharata.	
Mahanirvan Tantra.	
Manouchi	History of the Mogul Empire.
Manu	Manava Dharma Shastra.
Max Muller	Hibbert Lectures.
Meredith	Prophet of Nazara.
Mill	Subjection of Women.
Mitchel, Nicholas	Etudes Critiques.
Molloy	Faiths of the People.
Motley	Rise of Dutch Republic.
Nimohirad.	

Synoptic Gospels. • •

Thompson
Upanishads
Vedas
Vyas
Waddell

Wake
Wall

Wallace

Wherry

Mahabharata.
Expedition of Youndhus-
band.
Apostolic Fathers.
Grounds for Revision of
Hebrew Bible.
Miracles and Modern
Spiritualism.
Indian Evangelical Re-
view.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

Para 1. Mahomed's life—2. Forgeries in religious books—3. Koran's best book in Arabic—4. Wahi revelation—5. How revealed—6. Edited by Zeid—7. Arrangement of chapters—8. Seven editions—9. Heading of chapters—10. Meccan and Medina Suras—11. Mahomed's hatred of idolatry—12. Idolatry in India—13. Mahomed persecuted—14. Hadis and Chronicle of Al Tabari—15. Mistakes in Koran—16. Charge of Imposture—17. Mahomed's successors—18. Propagation of religion by force—19. Persecutions by Christians—20. Horrors of the Inquisition—21. No persecution in India—22. Persecution by Mahomedans—23. Veneration for Koran—24. Arabic characters newly invented—25. Koran on preserved table, only one prophecy—26. Koran why in Arabic—27. Errors in Koran—28. Revelations in religion—29. Vedas revealed—30. Old Testament revealed—31. Old Testament forged—32. Old Testament destroyed during Captivity—33. Spinoza's criticism—34. Three discordant Versions—35. New Testament—36. Forgeries in—37. Mention of Christ by contemporary historians—38. Christ's identity doubted.

CHAPTER 1.

DOINGS OF MAHOMED

Para 1. Introduction—2. Mahomed's massacre of the Jews—3. Zeid's wife—4. Ayesha left behind—5. Mary Copt's affair—6. Criticism.

CHAPTER II.

MAHOMED'S RELIGION.

Para 1. Main divisions of Mahomedanism—2. Fatihat and Lord's Prayer compared—3—6. Lord's Prayer criticised—7. Creed of Islam—8. God's attributes—9. God's names—10. Mahomed's Unity and Christians' Trinity—11. Brotherhood of Man—12. Jesus silent regarding brotherhood—13. Religious wars of Christians—14. Albigensian heresy suppressed and Holy Inquisition started—15. Science suppressed—16. Persecution in England—17. No toleration among Christians formerly—18. Extirpation of aborigines and their forcible conversion in America—19. Negro Slavery—20. Christian Pizzaro most cruel man—21. Men still brutes—22. No brotherhood in old religions—23. Brotherhood among Moslems—24. Islam not religion of humanity—25. Heaven and Hell—26. Borrowed idea—27. Seven heavens and earths—28. General belief in seven heavens—29. Enjoyments in heaven—30. Perpetual virgins in heaven—31. Fruits in heaven—32. No prepared dish in heaven—33. No intellectual pleasure in heaven—34. Jesus silent as to intellectual pleasures in heaven—35. Jesus' idea of heaven vague—36. St. John's idea of fruits in heaven—37. Reward according to merit—38. Punishment in hell—39. Purgatory—40. Resurrection and Last Day—41. Trumpet blast—42. Resurrection of animals—43. Book, Balance' and Bridge in hell—44. God to judge—45. Resurrection and day of judgment borrowed ideas—46. Hour uncertain—47. Proof of resurrection—48. Book of Fate—49. Leading ideas in Koran—50. Predestination—51. Criticism on—52. Idea general—

53. • • Prayer—54. Kebla—55. Ablutions—56. Angels—57. Gabriel and Eblis—58. Alms—59. Fasting—60. Criticism—61. Idea general—62. Pilgrimage—63. Mecca inviolate—64. Idea of pilgrimage general.

CHAPTER III.

MAHOMED'S OTHER PRECEPTS.

Para 1. Introduction—2. War against infidels—3. Toleration—4. Killing prisoners—5. Infanticide forbidden—6. Drinking forbidden—7. Drinking in other religions—8. Coffee and tobacco—9. Games forbidden—10. Usury forbidden—11. Meats allowed—12. Meats prohibited—13. Prohibitions in other religions—14. Fish—15. Criminal law—16. Civil Law—17. Marriage and divorce—18. Hindu law of inheritance—19. Slavery—20. Circumcision—21. Among Jews—22. Birth of Jesus—23. Crucifixion—24. Sign demanded—25. Creation in six days—26. Bible theory—27. Creation of Adam—28. World millions of years old—29. Upanishad theories about creation—30. Pauranic theories—31. Adam naming things—32. Sabbath—33. Al Gazaly's theory about Koran—34. Mahomed silent—35. Koran written by God—36. Dr. Sell's criticism—37. Bad selection of language—38. Abrogations—39. Inconsistencies in the Koran—40. Piecemeal revelation—41. Soul of women—42. Mahomed's noble sayings—43. Sermon on the Mount—44. Mothers of Christ and Mahomed—45. Koran for Arabs.

CHAPTER IV.

OTHER CRITICISMS.

Para 1. Equality of the sexes—2. •Plato's Republic—3. Ideas respecting women generally held—4. Mothers of great men—5. Christian missionaries and Mahomed—6. Prideaux's criticism—7. Carlyle's panegyric—8. Amir Ali's ditto—9. They criticised.

CHAPTER V.

CHRISTIANITY AND MAHOMEDANISM COMPARED.

Para 1. Eucharist and infant murder—2. Wine—3. Creation of man—4. Resurrection of animals—5. Christian creed—6. Stoicism—7. No description of heaven and hell in the Gospels—8. Priesthood—9. Prayer for success in war—10. Unity of God—11. Forgiveness of sins—12. Summing up—13. Intellectual progress of Saracens—14. Advancement of Saracenic learning—15. Saracenic libraries—16. Early Christians—17. Christians in Dark Ages—18. Backwardness of Mahomedans to-day.

INTRODUCTION.

As my subject is Mahomedanism, not Mahomed, I intend saving very few words regarding his life. He belonged to the family of Koreish, the most illustrious in Mecca, the Macoraba of the Greeks, who were in charge of the temple of Caaba and his great-grand-father was the governor of Mecca. He was born in 569 or 570, and his parents dying when he was very young, his grand-father brought him up, and after him his father's uterine brother brought him up. He does not seem to have received any education. In fact the Arabs had no written characters till they were invented by Moramer Ibn Morra, of Irak, who lived only a few years before Mahomed, and the characters were introduced into Arabia in Mahomed's time. He took service under a rich widow Khadija, older in years than Mahomed, and afterwards married her and she was his sole wife as long as she lived. She was his first disciple and he called her one of the four perfect women, the other three being his daughter Fatima, Asia, the wife of the Pharoah and Virgin Mary "the daughter of Imran," mentioned in *Ch. 66, vs. 11-12*. Vide Sale's Note on these verses. He travelled as far as Syria on his wife's business. In his fortieth year the first five verses of the ninety-sixth chapter of the Koran were revealed to him. Ali was his next disciple. The number of his disciples gradually increased. Abu Beer, a very influential member of the Koreish family also became his disciple. Mahomed was perse-

cut^d because he condemned idolatry and twice his enemies tried to capture and kill him but failed. On one occasion he and Abu Becr had to hide themselves in a cave and when his pursuers came to its mouth, a pigeon flew out and when they entered the cave they met a spider's web across it. So they returned and Mahomed's life was saved. Soon after Mahomed and his friends fled to Medina. This was on Friday the twentieth June 622, called the Flight or Hejirā and the Mahomedan era commences from this date. At Medina he had a large number of disciples and with their aid he attacked the caravans of the Meccans thirty-eight times and fought twenty-seven pitched battles with them, the principal ones being at Beder in A.H. 2 in which he won with a handful of men against heavy odds mustered by the Meccans, in which God is said to have assisted him with 3000 angels, and the other was the battle of Ohod fought next year against the Meccans, but he lost it. Ultimately he captured Mecca in A.H. 8 and died on 8th June, 632, leaving nine widows, of whom Ayesha, the daughter of Abu Becr, was his favourite wife. He was succeeded by Abu Becr. He left no direction either in the Koran or by word of mouth regarding his succession, and so the fight for the throne and leadership has been going on since the time of Othman who succeeded Omar who succeeded Abu Becr. He conquered the whole of Arabia and it became Mahomedan, except that one Mosleima maintained the old religion in a corner of Arabia. As to what the Arabs, called Saracens, did, I refer the reader of Gibbon's *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* and to Ockley's *History of the Saracens*. Mr. Bradlaugh in his work, *Religion, What and*

Why, p. 98, published in 1876, gives a comparative statement of the followers of the principal religions of the world, in which Moslems come third. The figures are as follows :—

Buddhist	...	405,600,000
Christians	...	399,200,000
Mahomedans	...	204,200,000
Brahminists	...	174,200,000
Nondescript Heathens		111,000,000
Jews	...	5,000,000

Total about ... 1,300,000,000

So that the proportion of Moslems is as 2 to 13 or nearly 15 per cent of the total population of the world. I do not think it necessary to say more about the events of Mahomed life. I have however mentioned some in the body of the book. Nor do I wish to say anything about the 73 sects into which the Moslems are divided according to *Sa'le*, who wrote in 1734, and since that time other sects have grown up, such as the revival of the sect of Motazilites who deny that the Koran is co-eternal with God, the sect of purists called Wahabis which originated in the eighteenth century in Nejd and the follower of Bahaia in the Punjab. If every man were to write down all his views about religion it would be found, I suspect, that there are as many sects as there are men. So I shall confine myself to the sayings of Mahomed in the Koran.

2. The principal religious books of the Hindus are many. The Jews have the Old Testament and some other apocryphal books. The Christians follow the Old Testament, the New Testament and the writings of the Fathers. In all the principal books

of these three religions various forgeries have been committed. For instance, the *Purusha Sukta* of the *Rig-Veda* (X 90) has been tampered with, the *Pentateuch* was never written by the so-called Moses but is a much later forgery, the critics of the *New Testament* have discovered forgeries in all the gospels and most of the epistles. Further, as the books were written by several writers, there are divergent views on many subjects. Mahomed's *Koran* is the work of one man, and it was edited within two years after his death and re-edited within ten years. So there has been no opportunity for any forgery or pious fraud in the *Koran* which distinguishes it from almost all other important religious works of ancient times.

3. Mahomed was an illiterate man, as he himself declares in the *Koran Ch. 7 v. 156* and his amanuensis wrote from his dictation. Practically his *Koran* was the first good composition in Arabic, Arabic written literature being then in its infancy. The *Koran* is the best book in the language in point of diction and literary style, and Mahomed was perfectly justified in challenging his contemporaries to produce a similar composition, *Ch. 7 v. 90, Ch. 10 v. 39*. It is exceedingly strange that this illiterate person should have composed the best book in the language. This is advanced as an argument in proof of its divine origin. The *Koran* was written on palm leaves, mutton bones and other strange writing materials, and when a chapter was finished it was kept in a wooden chest promiscuously with other chapters, and it is therefore very difficult to make any chronological arrangement of the chapters. Further the same chapter contains matters of diverse kinds, totally unconnected with each other, and sometimes

the same chapter contains verses written at Mecca and also at Medina, such as the second chapter, which is the longest chapter, which Sale says was revealed at Mecca and Medina, but Rodwell says it was revealed at Medina. The places where chapter 97 and 112 were revealed are in dispute. The first five verses of chapter 95 are said to have been first revealed, and then Mahomed kept quiet for three years.

4. The original Koran is said to have been on the preserved table from eternity, *Ch. 56 v. 76*, *Ch. 85 v. 22*, and Gabriel brought down some verses from it as occasion required *Ch. 17 v. 91*, and taught them to Mahomed, who dictated them to his amanuensis. Many verses were revealed on special occasions as they were needed, *Ch. 17 v. 107*. The commentators say that according to the doctrine of predestination, *Ch. 17 vs. 14-15*, the occasions which called forth these verses were predetermined by God from all eternity and so there is nothing extraordinary in it. The revelation according to Al Gazali was *wahi* or inspiration of prophets' or verbal inspiration by angels. Gabriel brought down some verses to Mahomed, *Ch. 20 v. 112*, and he dictated them to his amanuensis. But no explanation can be given as to why the events are described in the past tense. The Koran existed before the world was, and so all events should have been stated in the future tense. This was the objection of the Mutazilas, a sect of rationalists. Their other objection was that the Koran being eternal will last for eternity, even after the Day of Judgment and its commands and prohibitions will be binding. Wine is prohibited but there are rivers of wine in Paradise. Will the believers be able to drink it? These Mutazilas were favoured by Caliph Al Mamun, circa '813,

the son of the celebrated Haroun Al Rashid, who declared as heretics all believers in the eternity of the Koran, and many were put to death for holding this doctrine. But afterwards the tide turned and the Mutazilas were put to death and orthodoxy prevailed, though it is difficult to reconcile the co-existence of two eternals.

5. The first revelation came to Mahomed when he was in his fortieth year, and it consists of the first five verses of the ninety-sixth chapter. He told Ayesha as to how revelations came to him. The first ones were in dreams. One day Gabriel came to him and told him to read and he said he was not a reader. After three requests to read, and three refusals, Gabriel uttered the first five verses of the ninety-sixth chapter. After this Mahomed kept quiet for three years, as did Paul after his conversion and then revelations followed. They came sometimes like the noise of a bell and sometimes the angel would come like a man and converse with him. Gabriel paid him 24,000 visits, and the chapters were mostly delivered in parcels as occasion arose. After the chapters were written down on mutton bones, palm leaves, etc., from his mouth by his amanuensis, and published to his followers, they were put promiscuously in a chest.

6. After Mahomed's death, his successor Abu Becr, at the suggestion of Omar, got all the chapters of the Koran to be collected. The task of editing the Koran was entrusted to Zeid, Mahomed's principal amanuensis, who made over the manuscript to Hafsha, one of Mahomed's widows. Ten years after i. e. in 644, Caliph Othman ordered Zeid to collect all the copies of the Koran wherever found, and a new edition was issued, and all the copies of the old

edition were burnt. Zeid did not follow any chronological arrangement in his Koran. He numbered the chapters at random, the longest ones being placed at the beginning, and the Meccan and Medina suras were all mixed up. All copies of the Koran in the original Arabic and all translations have followed this arrangement. Rodwell was the first to make an attempt to arrange them in a chronological order which is a very difficult task. Sale's translation, published in 1734, followed the old arrangement and the verses not were numbered. But Rodwell has also numbered them as in the Arabic Koran, and I have therefore followed Rodwell's translation, but the chapters have been numbered as in the original Arabic text. Out of the 114 chapters (suras) of the Koran, Rodwell places 90 in the Meccan list and the rest in the Medina list.

7. The first sura, called Fatiha, is an invocation of God and His praise. The chapter is highly spoken of and is esteemed as the quintessence of the Koran. It is termed "the opening of the Book," "the completion," "the sufficing Sura," the "Sura of praise, thanks and prayer," "the Healer," "the remedy," "the Basis," "the Treasure," "the mother of the Book," "the seven verses of repetition." Including the formula, there are the same number of petitions in this sura as in the Lord's Prayer. It is recited several times in each of the five daily prayers and on many other occasions, as in concluding a bargain, etc. The word *Amen* is used always after this prayer, such being the instructions of Gabriel. The big chapters are full of diverse matters, most incoherently placed together, so that there is no methodical arrangement in the big suras, and the text is almost an unread-

able and incongruous patch-work ; "une assemblage," says M. Kasimirski in his Preface, "informe et incoherent de precepts moraux, religieux, civils et politiques, meles d'exhortations, de promesses, et de menances." I do not blame Mahomed for this. The whole thing was due to his illiteracy and to Zeid's incompetence as an editor. But I find one great defect in the composition of the Koran. There are many repetitions of the same matter in it. Heavenly joys and hell fire are mentioned in hundreds of places. That Mahomed is an unlettered prophet is repeated in almost adjoining verses, such as *Ch. 7 vs. 156, 158*. There are many such repetitions. Further there is no logical arrangement of the subjects. Why should God have composed such a badly arranged book? We cannot blame Zeid only for this defect. Gibbon says that in the Koran there is "an endless incoherent rhapsody of fable, and precept, and declamation, which seldom excites a sentiment or an idea, which sometimes crawls in the dust, and is sometimes lost in the clouds. The divine attributes exalt the fancy of the Arabian missionary; but his loftiest strains must yield to the sublime simplicity of the book of Job, composed in a remote age, in the same country, and in the same language. If the composition of the Koran exceed the faculties of a man, to what superior intelligence should we ascribe the Iliad of Homer, or the Philipics of Demosthenes?" *Gibbon, Ch. 50, Vol. 9, pp. 265-6.*

8. There are at present seven principal editions of the Koran, two published at Medina, the third at Mecca, the fourth at Cufa, the fifth at Basra, the sixth in Syria and the seventh is the common or vulgar edition. The first Medina edition contains 6000.

verses, the second and fifth 6214, the third 6219, the fourth 6236, the sixth 6226 and the last 6225. But they are all said to contain the same number of words, viz., 77,639 and the same number of letters, viz., 323,015, for the Mahomedans have in this also imitated the Jews and they have superstitiously numbered the very words and letters of their law; nay, they have taken pains to compute the number of times each particular letter of the alphabet is contained in the Koran.

9. Every chapter of the Koran except the ninth is headed by the words "Bismulla Rahamanur-Rahim," in the name of the most merciful God. All Mahomedans head their letters or any writing of importance with these words, as all devout Bengali Hindus put at the top of their letters the words "Sree Sree Kali Sahay" or "Sree Sree Durga Sahay", i. e. let Kali or Durga assist the writer. This formula of Mahomed is of Jewish origin, first taught the Koreish by Omayah of Taief, a little older than Mahomed, who had learnt this formula in Syria.

10. The Meccan suras (chapters) were written to persuade the Meccans to accept his religion, the style is more poetic and the spirit is one of submission, but those written after his flight to Medina in 622 and the open declaration of war with his kinsmen are of a different kind. They are more or less menacing and after the battle of Beder in 624, in which he succeeded with a handful of men to rout a large army of the Meccans, he assumed a dictatorial tone, and began to legislate for his followers. The Meccan suras speak of God only, but the Medina suras speak of "God and his Apostle", and instead of the expression "obey God", we find, almost always,

the expression "obey God and his Apostle" and "gifts to God and his Apostle", "God's pleasure and his Apostle's", and epithets formerly applied to God only are now applied to the Apostle, *Ch. 9 v. 129*, and one-fifth of the booty is the share of "God and the Apostle," *Ch. 8 v. 42*. This shows that his head was turned by his victory at Beder. The Meccan suras were written in beautiful verse but the Medina ones, with some exceptions, are in prose. The fact is that Mahomed was at first only a preacher of his religion and had no cause of quarrel or enmity with his people. But persecution and two attempts on his life embittered his soul and he began to fulminate all sorts of curses on the unbelievers. Even in his early days at Medina he was very conciliatory. He said "let there be no compulsion in religion", *Ch. 2 v. 257*. Sale says that this chapter was revealed partly in Mecca and partly in Medina, but Rodwell says that it was revealed at Medina. So if Sale is right this must have been a Meccan verse. Could there be anything nobler than what Mahomed said in an early Meccan sura: "Good and evil are not to be treated as the same thing. Turn away evil by what is better, and lo, he, between whom and thyself was enmity, shall be as though he were a warm friend. But none attain to this save men steadfast in patience and none attain to it except the most highly favoured. And if an enticement from Satan entice thee, then take refuge in God, for He is the Hearing, the Knowing", *Ch. 41 v. 34-36*, and in another Meccan sura he says, "He who forgiveth and is reconciled unto his enemy shall be rewarded by God, for he loveth not the unjust doers," *Ch. 42 v. 38*. But after his flight he became embittered:

in his feelings against the idolatrous Meccans, his persecutors, and he began to fulminate several threats of eternal hell for them, and after his victory at Beder over the Meccans in A. H. 2 he began to legislate for his followers. He went so far as to say to the believers, "form no intimacies among others than yourselves. They will not to fail corrupt you," *Ch. 3 v. 114*, thus practically severing all connection with the idolaters. He also said, 'O believers, take not the Jews or Christians as friends,' *Ch. 5 v. 56*. He went to the extreme when he said, "take not your fathers or your brothers as friends if they love infidelity above faith", *Ch. 9 v. 23*. He orders the killing of the idolaters after the four sacred months are over, "wherever ye shall find them, and seize them and besiege them and lay wait for them with every kind of ambush," but if they become converts "then let them go their way," *Ch. 9 v. 5*. In the same chapter, *verse 36*, Mahomed orders his followers to attack the idolaters in all months. This difference between the mild and persuasive nature of the Meccan suras and the stern nature of the Medina suras is not difficult to observe. The earlier ones were in fine verse, the latter mostly in prose. The former are concerned more with religion, the latter contain the edicts of Mahomed, promulgating the laws to be followed by the Moslems.

11. I have a great admiration for Mahomed for his iconoclastic views regarding idolatry. Almost in every chapter it is stated that God is one and not more. He even found fault with the doctrine of the Trinity, and he calls the followers of this doctrine infidels, *Ch. 4 v. 169*, *Ch. 5 v. 77*, and

Mahomed was perfectly justified in saying this, as God cannot be divided into three parts, and the doctrine is unintelligible and was so to the first propagator, Athanasius. Vide *Gibbon, Vol. 3. Ch. 21 p. 318* The atheist says that there is no God but all is Nature. So the question of one or more Gods does not arise in his case. If a man believes in a God, then why increase the number? Is not one God enough? The idols are said to be his visible representations. Is God visible? Has anybody, excluding Abraham and Moses, seen him? If he is infinite in power, why should he require so many assistants and incarnations to assist him in doing his work? Was His work at a standstill before these idols were made by man? Did any idol assist God in his creation of the universe or in the governing of it? It won't do to say that these idols existed from eternity or that the gods which these idols represent so existed. Was not one God enough before creation? Hindus say that the Supreme Being Brahma created the lesser gods: Brahma, the creator, Vishnu, the preserver and Shiva, the destroyer. Could not God have done His work without their assistance? Has God taken rest after creating the lesser gods, and who will then do all His work? The God of the Jews took rest after six days' hard work, but even the Jews do not say that God has taken rest for ever, so that the question of the necessity of having assistants to overlook His work in his periods of rest does not arise, as God is infinite in power and omnipresent.

12. In India, idolatry is a necessity for the priests, as their livelihood depends upon the worship of the idols, which brings grist to their mill. So the priests

support idolatry and idolatry supports the priests in return. The priests are all Brahmins, all other classes being prohibited from performing any kind of religious ceremony without the assistance of Brahmins. Thus castehood became inseparably connected with Hinduism. Abolish castehood, and the exclusive privileges of the Brahmins will vanish, and with it idolatry. So long as castehood remains in India, idolatry cannot leave this country. This is neither the time nor the place to trace the history or the effect of castehood. So I do not wish to say more on this subject. But I repeat what I said before, and say that I have the greatest admiration for Mahomed for his hatred of idolatry, though I do not approve his method of abolishing it, nor the Christian method too, which was nearly similar. I am for absolute toleration. Let every man follow any religion or do any act he likes, provided he does not interfere with the life or liberty of others, such as performing human sacrifice. Herein also I am a follower of Mahomed, for at an early period of his mission, he had uttered these wise words, "Let there be no compulsion in religion," *Ch. 2 v. 257*. It was after his flight, when he became exasperated against his kinsmen and the other citizens of Mecca, that he uttered defiance to his enemies and ordered their killing. I believe the previously mentioned verses about the killing of infidels and idolaters related to special occasions and to particular idolaters who were his enemies and do not apply to all idolaters then living or subsequently born. In fact such is the opinion of the Sunnis, who form the largest majority of Mahomedans, and which opinion, is now followed by all Mahomedans in their

relation to idolaters, whom they do not kill at sight.

13. It is a pity that such a good and truth-seeking man like Mahomed had his soul embittered by his persecutors, who twice attempted to seize him and put him to death. Among the great religious reformers of the world, Buddha was the only man who was not persecuted by his opponents the Brahmins, who followed the religion of the Vedas, whereas Buddha preached a religion opposed to the Vedas, and he abolished the social order of castehood. Socrates and Jesus were capitally punished for their heterodoxy, and Mahomed narrowly escaped such a death, but no attempt was ever made upon Buddha's life and he died a natural death when he was eighty years old. This shows the mild nature of the Hindu. He never killed any religious teacher, never had any Inquisition, never burnt any heretic at the stake. He never made converts, so the question of conversion by force never arose. But the Buddhists were the first missionaries of a religion, and it is a remarkable fact in the history of the world that the Buddhists never sought to convert any one by force, whereas Christians and Mahomedans have sought to convert people by force. In the case of Mahomedans I can understand their action, for the Koran itself orders forcible conversion, or payment of tribute, *Ch. 9. v. 29*, but what has the Christian to justify the forcible conversion of heretics?

14. The Koran is the basis of Mahomedanism. The word Koran means 'reading.' But besides the Koran, the Mahomedans believe in the traditional sayings of Mahomed (hadis) which were gathered

together and published in six books more than two hundred years after Mahomed's death. The Sunni sect places great reliance upon them, though their authenticity is doubtful. The Shiahs believe in five other books, published at a later period. The most famous book on the Sonna is that of Al Bochari, *Gibbon, Vol. 9, Ch. 50, p. 266*. Besides these holy books, there is the Chronicle of Al Tabari written about 900-920 which is, next to the Koran, the principal source of Mahomedanism and upon this Chronicle all mediaeval chronicles, Mahomedan, Jewish or Christian, are based, *Johnson, Rise of Christendom, p. 133*. Johnson goes so far as to say that "if in a broad illustrative sense, there are three branches of Christendom, Islam, Judaism and Catholicism, then Islam is the eldest. Arabia is the common mother of the great mediaeval tradition. The order of the three days of worship, Friday, Saturday, Sunday, represents the chronological relation of the three systems".

15. The Koran records many events narrated in the Bible and some apocryphal gospels and the Talmud, but sometimes the facts are mistakenly stated. For instance Mary, the mother of Jesus, is said to have been the daughter of Imran, *Ch. 19 v. 29, Ch. 66 v. 12*. This Imran is the Arabic for Aaron, the brother of Moses, whose sister was Miriam, not Virgin Mary. The fact is that Mahomed being illiterate could not read the Bible, and the Bible and the Apocryphal gospels were not translated into Arabic before 900 A. D. He had therefore to memorise the stories in the Bible and so he committed this and other mistakes. Another instance of his bad memory is that in chapter seven he says that six prophets, Noah, Hud, Saleh, Lot, Shoaib and Moses lived before.

him, whereas in chapters eleven and thirty-seven he adds the name of Ibrahim (Abraham) before Lot. He took many stories from the Bible, and he quoted from it only once, *Ch. 21 v. 5*, quoting the words of Psalm, *Ch. 37 v. 29*. Mahomed also took many ideas from the Ebionites, a Jewish sect, who practised circumcision, were opposed to celibacy, forbade turning to the sunrise, declared Jerusalem as their kebla, and enjoined washings and allowed oaths by clouds, etc., and he took from the Persians the ideas of resurrection, the final judgment of mankind, and their passing over the edge of a sharp sword, hell and paradise. The idea of Satan is also of Persian origin. He did not take these ideas directly from the Persians, but they originally came from a Persian source, and we find Jesus also embodying them in his religion.

16. Christians are very severe upon Mahomed. They call him an impostor, just as his contemporaries called him one, *Ch. 3 v. 181*, *Ch. 25 v. 5-6*, and his defence was that previous apostles have also been called liars, *Ch. 23 v. 46-50*, though they came with clear proofs of their mission, *Ch. 3 v. 181*. The fact is that he had epilepsy from his infancy, and many verses he uttered when he was in a fit or just after the fit was over, and his followers believed that he was inspired when he uttered the verses. As to Gabriel giving him portions of the book as occasion required, *Ch. 17 v. 107*, it is very probable that Mahomed believed that he got them from a superhuman source, and as Gabriel was the principal angel and the chief messenger of God, he naturally thought that it was Gabriel who gave him the inspiration. Mahomed believed in angels and all Mahomedans believe in their existence. That

does not prove that they exist. All Christians believe in their existence. Luther saw them in the sixteenth century and Milton in the seventeenth century bases the best epic in the English language upon the belief in their existence. Even as late as the nineteenth century, Alfred Russel Wallace, who shares with Darwin the discovery of what is now called Darwinism, believed in their existence, and he bases his theory of the truth of miracles upon the existence of supernatural beings, vide his *Miracles and Modern Spiritualism*, p. 207. These beings must be angels. However what's in a name? It appears that formerly all people believed in the existence of angels or supernatural beings. From the savage down to the most civilized man, this belief was general. Modern Christians have almost given up this belief, and I believe modern educated Mahomedans are also of the same opinion, but many highly educated Hindus still believe in their existence. So Mahomed, who lived 1300 years ago, is not to be blamed for this belief. We in the twentieth century have ceased to believe in angels, ghosts and witches, but everybody knows that this disbelief is very recent. The contemporaries of Shakespeare believed in them; angels, ghosts and witches are his characters, and the trial of witches ceased in Christian and civilized England in the eighteenth century, vide, *Campbell's Lives of the Chief Justices*, Vol. 3 p. 5. Therefore it is not proper to blame Mahomed. He may be wrong in his belief, and many of us believe he was wrong, but his justification was the belief of his contemporaries, which should be the sole standard in these matters. We are not justified in calling our fathers fools. Are"

we not fools ourselves and have not our sons an equal right to call us fools, as we call our fathers fools? If Christians call Mahomed an impostor, have not Mahomedans an equal right to apply the same epithet to Christ? Mahomed said he got his revelations not directly from God but through Gabriel and that he was a mere man and an apostle, *Ch. 3 v. 138*, *Ch. 5 v. 65*, *Ch. 18 v. 110*, *Ch. 30 v. 38*, *Ch. 7 v. 158*, *Ch. 17 v. 95-6*, but Jesus has been made to say that "he only knows the Father." *11 Mat. 27*, "he came to save," *18 Mat. 11*, "I am from above, ye are from beneath," *8 J. 23*, "I and my Father are one" *10 J. 30*. This blasphemy enraged his hearers and they sought to stone him, and he said that he meant to say that he was the Son of God, *v. 36*, which every man, without any exception, is, and so there is nothing new in it. I do not admit the authenticity of the gospel of John. Renan has shown that it is apocryphal and it was not mentioned by any author before 170 A. D., *Life of Christ pp. 11-13*. If Renan is right then Jesus never uttered these words. A non-believer may call religious reformers like Buddha, Christ and Mahomed impostors. But we should be charitable and the best thing to do so is to say that they believed but falsely believed in their mission from God and gave utterances to things which they believed to be true. Therefore I deprecate the statement of Christian missionaries that Mahomed was an impostor. Mahomed never called Jesus an impostor, he called him an apostle, *Ch. 4 v. 169*, *Ch. 5 v. 79*, a servant of God, *Ch. 43 v. 59*. If Mahomed could be so charitable to Christ, why should Christ's followers be uncharitable to Mahomed, and call him an impostor? The contemporaries of Mahomed called

him an impostor *Ch. 25 v. 5-6*, but his reply was that all former apostles have been called impostors, *Ch. 23 v. 46*. Mahomed curses those who brought the charge of imposture against him, and he repeats ten times the words "Woe on that day to those who charged with imposture", *Ch. 77*. Mahomed in other places mentions the fact that this charge was brought against him, *Ch. 25 v. 5*, *Ch. 16 v. 105* and in *Ch. 23 v. 50* he says that Moses and Aaron were called impostors, and all previous apostles were called liars, *Ch. 23 v. 46 Ch. 3 v. 181*.

17. Mahomed was treated and respected like a king and he subdued the whole of Arabia except a small fraction of it and imposed his religion on his kingdom. His successors conquered within a hundred years after his death all the countries in Asia to the west of India, north Africa and Spain. Gibbon says that his successor Abu Beer took a stipend of three pieces of gold and the maintenance of a camel and a slave. He left at his death a coarse garment and five pieces of gold. The next Caliph, who was master of Persia, Asia Minor, Syria and Egypt, lived like Mahomed upon barley bread and dates and his drink was water; he preached in a gown that was torn or tattered in twelve places, and a Persian satrap found him one day sleeping among the beggars on the steps of the mosque of Medina. He left only nine pieces of gold, as Ockly says. Mahomed's fourth successor, the Caliph Ali, the son of his uncle and guardian, also hated pomp and vanity. He went to the mosque clad in a thin cotton gown, a coarse turban on his head, his slippers in one hand, and his bow in the other. There is an extraordinary story related of this Ali which shows how very conscientious he was, and

never regarded the State as himself like Louis XIV. One evening a friend of his went to see him on a private matter and Ali was doing state business with a Secrétary. When the business was over he asked his friend the reason of his coming. The friend said he had come on his private business. Ali immediately extinguished the lamp and ordered his servant to bring his own lamp. On enquiry by his friend he replied that he was doing state business and was burning state oil, but now he must burn his own oil as it was not state business but business of a private character. Has any Christian monarch shown any such conscientious scruple? Christian kings, till the other day, have exclaimed *l'état, c'est moi*. I have already said what respect was shown to Mahomed by his followers. Now what respect was shewn to Christ by his apostles and other followers? In what Christian country can we find a succession of four kings equally meek and humble like the four successors of Mahomed? Christ never converted his country and his countrymen everywhere disown him. The Koran is the work of one man. The Gospels were written by many people at different times and additions and embellishments have been going on since Christ's death till the end of the thirteenth century, as is amply proved by Mr. Edwin Johnson in his *Rise of Christendom*, so that we have not the Christ of history but all is fable.

18. That Mahomed was a great man nobody can deny. In the first place, as already observed, his book is still the best book in the language, and he was an illiterate man, *Ch. 7 v. 156*. He was so highly respected by his contemporaries that they caught the washings of his mouth and licked his spittle and

preserved his hair as mementos. Sale's *Preliminary Discourse*, p. 41. No other religious reformer was ever shown such high respect. Before his death all Arabia had abandoned idolatry, except some followers of Mosleima in Hodeida. Within a century after his death his followers, called Saracens, conquered Persia, Asia Minor, Palestine, Egypt and the rest of North Africa, and Spain, and fought with the French the battle of Tours in 732. In the next century they conquered all the countries between Persia and the Punjab. They spread their religion in these countries and they are still Mahomedan countries, excepting Spain from which they were driven in 1492, and Scinde, where Hindus and Sikhs form an important minority. Sale says that this religion was propagated by the sword, *Prel. Dis. Sec. 2, p. 38*. Most probably it was, as the Koran said in *Ch. 9 v. 3* "when the sacred months are passed, kill those who join other gods with God whenever ye shall find them; and seize them, and besiege them and lay in wait for them with every kind of ambush; but if they shall convert, and observe prayer, and pay the obligatory alms, then let them go their way, for God is Gracious, Merciful." In *Ch. 2 v. 186-189* Mahomed orders the killing of infidels till "the only worship be that of God." In *Ch. 47 v. 4-5* he says "when ye encounter the infidels, strike off their heads till ye have made a great slaughter among them, and of the rest make fast the fetters. And after this let there either be free dismissals or ransomings, till the war hath laid down its burden. Thus do." Sale, in a note upon these verses, says that the Hanifites judge this law to be abrogated, or to relate to the war of Beder. But the Persians and some others hold this command to be still in full force,

for, according to them, all adults taken in battle must either embrace Islam or be put to death.

19. But have not Christians also propagated their religion by force? At first they had humble beginnings. Gibbon says that till the conversion of Constantine in 305 A. D. the Christians formed only one fifth of the population of the Roman empire. But within less than a century his conversion the whole Roman empire became Christian, and their example was followed by the neighbouring barbarians, so that by the year 400 most of them became Christians. Why this previous slow progress during the first three centuries and such rapid progress during the fourth? Did not Constantine put any pressure and did not he hold out promise of reward to the converts and create 1800 bishops in the empire with an income of 6000 pounds sterling each and did not Theodosius destroy all the pagan temples, and both have been surnamed Great among all the emperors of Rome? Did not Gregory the Illuminator, in the beginning of the fourth century, destroy all pagan temples in Armenia, including some Hindu temples erected by some fugitive Hindu princes, and kill the Hindu priests? Charlemagne's conversion of the Saxons was not by preaching. What was the Inquisition? It forced many Spanish Moors to embrace Christianity or to leave the country. Such was also the fate of the Spanish Jews. It is not my purpose to abuse Mahomedans or Christians. They are my brethren just as Budhists and Hindus, my relations, are. The object of the Mahomedans was to banish idolatry as Mahomed had ordered. But what was the object of the Inquisition? It was principally to suppress heresy or schism among the Christians,

and what authority did Christ give for this suppression?

20. Regarding persecution of heretics I have said enough in my work on Christianity, pp. 157-159. The Christians were the first offenders in this respect, though Christ never uttered such a cruel doctrine. I would now only refer the reader upon this point particularly to Motley's *Rise of the Dutch Republic* wherein he will find among other humane (!) edicts of the Inquisition one most remarkable for its cruelty. In fact it surpasses all known edicts for its cruelty. "The Inquisition assisted Philip to place the heads of all his Netherland subjects upon a single neck for the same fell purpose. Upon the 16th February 1568, a sentence of the Holy Office condemned all the inhabitants of the Netherlands to death as heretics. From this universal doom only a few persons, especially named, were excepted. A proclamation of the King, dated ten days later confirmed this decree of the Inquisition, and ordered it to be carried into instant execution, without regard to age, sex, or condition. This is probably the most concise death-warrant that was ever framed. Three millions of people, men, women, and children, were sentenced to the scaffold in three lines." p. 364.

21. The Hindus, on the other hand, never thought of extending their religion. They never sent any missionary to any part of the world, with or without the sword, and so the question of forcible conversion does not arise in their case. The Buddhist religion was the first missionary religion, and its most famous follower, the emperor Asoka, sent missionaries everywhere. His edicts show that he sent missions to the territories of five Greek kings, and to other countries.

He sent his son and daughter to Ceylon as missionaries. 'Did the Buddhist missionaries carry sword or peace with them? In this respect the proverbial mild Hindu is the best specimen of humanity. I call the Buddhists Hindus, as Buddhism originated in India and is an offshoot of ancient Hinduism. The high-caste Hindus have practically abolished sacrifice and Buddhists are prohibited from taking life. Have the followers of any religion outside India a similar regard for life? I believe not. My readers will kindly not assume that I prefer Hinduism to Christianity or Mahomedanism. I do not believe in any of the essential doctrines of Hinduism or rather Brahminism. I am dead against idolatry and here I regard Mahomed as my best guru (master), as he was the greatest iconoclast the world has ever produced. Although I do not follow the idolatrous faith of the Hindus, still I admire one thing among them. Provided you do not attack the supremacy of Brahmins, you can bring any number of foreign colonists into India. The Nestorian Christians got a settlement in southern India in the early years of Christianity. In the ninth century the Parsee fugitives from Persia were granted lands in western India to settle. Can Christians and Mahomedans show similar toleration? On the other hand, after the conquest of Granada, the Moslems, and with them the Jews, were driven out of Spain or forcibly converted, so that all Spain may be Christian and the same fate overtook the Mexicans and Peruvians after the conquests of Cortez and Pizarro. As to the supremacy of the Brahmins being left inviolate, we find that the invaders of India from the north west and even the Buddhists have been absorbed into the Hindu fold because

they have acknowledged the supremacy of the Brahmins and taken their place in one or other of the three other subordinate castes. If Christians and Moslems do the same thing then they also will be admitted into Hinduism, as the Hindu Mahasabha has recently done. But as to Christians and Mahomedans there is one insuperable objection which must be got over. They must not take beef as the cow is a goddess according to modern Hindu ideas, though the Vedic Hindus took beef. As to the supremacy of Brahmins, my idea is that a Hindu can do any irreligious act provided he worships and feeds the Brahmins. They are the most intelligent people in the world as they are enjoying their supremacy since 4,000 years. This hereditary priesthood is not democratic and will soon vanish. But do not the Sayeds, the descendants of Mahomed in the female line, still claim high prerogatives? In Turkey they wear green turbans to distinguish them from the other Mahomedans. The fact is that nobody is willing to give up any privilege he has acquired, no matter how. And these Sayeds get stipends from the State, and are tried by their own chief.

22. As to the propagation of religion by force, we thus find that the people of India whether Hindus or Budhists never put any one to death to spread their religion, nor forcibly converted any one, whereas the Arabs did use force for propagating their religion, but if a man agreed to pay tribute, his life was spared. Thus the Koran ordered the Moslems to fight against and kill the idolaters, *Ch. 2 vs. 186-9*. It does nowhere order the killing of heretics, people, of the same faith, but belonging to a different sect.

The Jews were ordered to kill idolators 22 *Ex. 20*, the Mahomedans were ordered likewise. But there is no order in the Bible or the Koran to kill heretics. It remained for the followers of Christ, who was one of the meekest of men, and who nowhere orders the killing of any human being in any one of his numerous sayings, to fly at each other's throat for mere differences of opinion in matters of dogma though professing the same faith.

23. The Koran, which means 'reading' is held in very high veneration by the Mahomedans. No Mohamedans will allow it to touch the floor. It is always kept on a shelf or a table. Its laws are in force to-day among Mahomedans. But Hindus and Christians have changed their laws. The laws of Manu are not now in force in any part of India. The Mitakshara instead has prescribed rules of inheritance for India outside Bengal where the Dayabhaga prevails. Jesus laid down very few laws, and he said he had not come to destroy the law, but to fulfil. 5 *Mat. 17*, and that "till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled" 5 *Mat. 18*. He made an exception in one case, about divorce and marriage of divorced persons. In 5 *Mat. 32* he prohibits divorce except for adultery, and the man who will marry her that is divorced commits adultery, and in 19 *Mat. 6*, after saying that husband and wife are but one flesh, he says "what therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder," thus absolutely prohibiting divorce. But divorce has been prevalent in every Christian country. In fact neither the Jewish law nor the law prohibiting divorce and remarriage of divorced persons thus enunciated by

Jesus is prevalent in any country professing the Christian religion. The Bible is not treated with distinction. It is not called Sharif (High) as the Koran is. It can be placed on the floor while the Koran cannot be so placed. No doubt it will be said that Jesus is treated as God, whereas Mahomed is spoken of only as an apostle. But this adds more dignity to Mahomed who hated idolatry.

24. Mahomed says in the Koran that it is in Arabic, the perspicuous language, by which he means that the original Koran lying on the preserved table is in that language, and he boasts of it, *Ch. 41. v. 44, Ch. 43 v. 2*. Arabic characters were invented only a few years before Mahomed by Moramer Ibn Morra, a native of Irak, and most of his countrymen could not write as they had no characters to write with. Of course this would not prevent the Koran from being written in heaven in Arabia though it had no written characters on earth. But would it not have better if the book had been written in Greek characters, as Greek was the most extensively used language in countries bordering on Arabic? But it would have prevented Mahomed from understanding the Koran in a foreign language. In Mahomed's time his countrymen were illiterate, semi-civilized people. Further there is nothing in the boast that the original Koran is in Arabic. If it had been in Greek it would have been read by more people, and was the Koran intended only for the ignorant people of Arabia? This may lead one to think that the Koran was originally intended for his countrymen only, and but for the Saracen conquests would have been confined to Arabia.

25. The Koran says that it has been

from eternity and has been lying on the preserved table; *Ch. 43 vs. 21-2*. This table is a very large one, and every action that takes place is recorded therein. Now this Koran is deficient in many respects. It does not mention any event which Mahomed was not aware of. In fact it is limited by the horizon of Mahomed's knowledge, and we know from Mahomed's own lips that he was an illiterate person, *Ch. 7 v. 156*. If so, the horizon of his knowledge, and therefore of the Koran, was very limited. The Koran mentions the religions of the Jews and the Christians and of no other people on earth, such as Hinduism and Buddhism. If the Koran was created by God, or was co-existent with God, why should it not mention many important events which took place outside Arabia before Mahomed's time, and why should it be confined to events which had happened at or before the time of Mahomed? The Koran mentions no historical event which is to take place in future except one, when in *chapter 30 vs. 1-3* Mahomed says that "the Greeks have been defeated in a land nearby, but after their defeat they shall defeat their foes in a few years." Rodwell, in a note to these verses says that the verses are written in such a way that they can be read in either sense. It is very difficult to explain this omission in the Koran, for we cannot admit God's deficiency of knowledge of the past, nor his ignorance of the future. This puzzles me and leads me to believe that the Koran is not a divine book. No doubt Mahomed thought it to be divine but until I can get over this difficulty I cannot agree with him. I have tried my best to solve the difficulty caused by these serious omissions, and commissions, such as that Mary, the mother of Jesus

was the daughter of Imran (Aaron) *Ch. 66 v. 12*, *Ch. 19 v. 29*. A book which is co-eternal with God, according to Al Gazali, the greatest philosopher among the Arabs, must be without any blemish.

26. Mahomed also claims that the Koran is a revealed book, extracts from the original Koran lying on the Preserved Table having been now and then brought from heaven and given to Mamomed *Ch. 2 v. 91*, *Ch. 6 v. 10*, *Ch. 10 v. 38-39*, *Ch. 13 v. 39*. The Koran is in Arabic. Mahomed says (*Ch. 26 v. 44*, *Ch. 43 v. 2*) that if the Koran had been written in a foreign tongue they (the people) had surely said "unless its signs be made clear...what in a foreign tongue and the people Arabian?" The Vedas were written for the Hindus only, the Old Testament was intended by God for the Jews only, two very exclusive races. Was the Koran written by God for the Arabians only? Arabic language had practically no good compositions to boast of. It was like the Hebrew, which, besides the Bible could boast of practically no literature, as all its lay literature before Christ can be bound in one volume. It is very difficult to understand why the deity selected the two Schemetic languages for the Old Testament and the Koran. They were languages without vowel points which were subsequently invented and what about their flexibility and capacity for expressing His meaning? The Hebrew and Arabic were not the two most ancient languages, whereas Greek was by far the most extensively used language outside Judea and Arabia, and which language is "the most happy composition of human art," *Gibbon Ch. 53, Vol. 10, p. 154*.

27. But this book is so full of errors of omission and commission that I cannot believe that it came

from God through the angel Gabriel, Further how did Gabriel reveal the book to Mahomed? The Koran is silent on this matter. Did Gabriel furnish Mahomed now then with extracts from the original Koran lying on the preserved table? If copies of extracts were brought by Gabriel, were the copies brought by Gabriel copied on any material, and if on what material, and why were not those copies or those materials shown to others and preserved for posterity? Further Mahomed was illiterate as he calls himself *Ch. 7 vs. 156, 158*. How could he read those copies? Then it may be said that Gabriel recited to Mahomed the verses in the extracts he had brought. In that case it may have been that Mahomed forgot many verses between the time when he met Gabriel and the time when they were put into writing by his amanuensis. Further how could Mahomed know that his visitor was Gabriel? If he used to meet Gabriel often, and it is said that they met 24,000 times, then why did not Mahomed ask Gabriel about mundane affairs? These are very difficult questions to answer and I fail to answer them. Consequently I am of opinion that the Koran like the Vedas and the Bible is not a revealed book. If Mahomed, as stated by himself, got the revelations in true dreams, how could he remember every saying of Gabriel as dreams often deceive men? Further why were the verses "sent down piecemeal" (*Ch. 17 v. 107*) which has made the book a jumble of heterogenous matters? Lastly, how could Mahomed distinguish a true dream from a false one? The fact is that all ancients believed in dreams. The Bible is full of visions and dreams, and Mathew mentions five dreams in his first chapter concerning

the miraculous conception of Christ. We in the twentieth century have lost all faith in dreams and regard them as idle.

28. Many nations alleged that their religious books were revealed by God. The Hindus say that all Vedic writings were revealed. In fact the word Veda comes from the root *vida*. to hear, the verses having been originally heard by the Rishis. The earliest Veda is the Rig-Veda, the other three Vedas mostly containing extracts from it. The third Veda has only 78 original verses out of 1549, the rest being taken from the Rig Veda. There is very little of importance in a religious or moral sense in the Rig-Veda or the other three Vedas, the contents thereof being mostly praise of the gods and requests of favours from them, besides descriptions of rites and sacrifices. Next come the Branhmas which contain a dry list of formulas and rites, and Max Muller says that "the general character of the Brahmanas is marked by shallow and insipid grandiloquence, by priestly conceit and antiquarian pedantry.....these works deserve to be studied as the physician studies the twaddle of idiots, and the raving of madmen. They will disclose to thoughtful eyes the ruins of faded grandeur, the memories of noble aspirations. But let us only try to translate these works into our own language, and we shall feel astonished that human language and human thought should ever have been used for such purposes." (*Ancient Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 389, 390.) The last portion of the Vedas is called Upanishads. They are really books on religion. They discuss the questions of the nature and attributes of God, but some of them are very recent such as Alla Upanishad. The Vedas

and Upanishads also try to describe creation, wherein they with their limited knowledge of science, went beyond their depth and ended by saying things which they did not understand, nor is any human being able to understand, being mostly figures of speech and allegories.

29. Assuming that the Vedas were revealed, what do we find now? There was no writing in those days, writing being invented much later, though long before the fourth century B. C., as Nearchus, the Admiral of Alexander the Great, says that Indians used to write upon paper made from cotton. Even to-day there are people near my village who make paper from cotton. It is called *tulat kaga-z*, cotton paper. There being no writing in use the vedas were transmitted orally and so many different readings came into existence and the Brahmins took advantage of this state of things in forging several passages in the holy text. For instance, they forged verse 12 of the famous Purusha Sukta, *Rig Veda*, X. 90, which is called the Charter of the Brahmins. In that verse it is said that Brhmins were the mouth of Purusha (God), the Kshatriyas the arms, the Vaisyas the thigh, and the Sudras came out of his legs. In the next verse it is stated that Indra and Fire were created from the mouth of Purusha and in v. 14 it is stated that the land (earth) was created from his legs. So how could Brahmins be the mouth of God when from it sprang Indra and Fire, and the Shudras and the earth came out of his legs. I cite only one instance of forgery: The Mahabharat contained originally a hundred thousand couplets, but now it contains sixteen thousand additional couplets and it is diffi-

cult to separate the forged verses from the genuine, the chaff from the wheat.

30. The Jews also claim that the Old Testament is a revealed book and herein they have got the support of the Christians, the founder of whose religion was a Jew, and the first propagators of whose religion were also Jews, so that the Gentiles, afterwards converted to Christianity, were bound to follow their original masters, and the early Christians had to base the necessity of Christ's coming upon the necessity of saving men from the effects of the Original Sin of our first parents, the result being that the early Christians had to admit the truth of everything narrated in the Old Testament, which told the grand story of creation in six days and of man's fall, and Jesus had to come down to this mundane earth after the lapse of many milleniums for the redemption of man.

31. The Old Testament is full of forgeries. It was written in Hebrew, which language became a dead language during the Captivity in the sixth century B. C. The oldest manuscript of the Old Testament is only 900 years old. The principal books of that Testament are the five books of Moses. No one knows when, where, and by whom those books called the Pentateuch were written, or by whom preserved (*Spinoza, Tractatus Theologico Politicus Chs. 7-9.*) He says many errors and various readings have crept into the text. Rabbi Jacob ben Chajian admits that during the captivity, when the sacred books were lost and scattered about, and those wise men who were skilled in the Scriptures were dead, the men of the great Synagogue found different readings in the sacred books, and in every place where they met

words and sentences are not separated by any space and there are no accents to indicate the proper pronunciation. Now the deficiency of vowels has been supplied by points, but they are recent innovations. Ancient Hebrew was written without points (vowels and accents). *Tractatus Theologico Politicus* Ch. 7 p. 156. In fact many translations were by conjecture Gosenius' *Hebrew Lexicon* by Leo p. 17. For instance, the word JHV is rendered as Jehovah. Bishop Colenso says that the Pentateuch was written by five writers—1st Elohist, 2nd Elohist, who used the word Elohim for God, 1st Jehovist, 2nd Jehovist, using the word Jehovah for God, 5th Deuternomist. Kurtz (*Colenso pt. 4 p. 15*) and Ewald, and Delitzsch, though trying to prove the authorship of Moses, finally admit that several writers wrote the Pentateuch. De Wette (*Book of Moses Sec. 163*) is of the same opinion. Much more can be written on this inexhaustible subject, but I think I have succeeded in shewing that the Pentateuch is not a genuine book in any sense of the word and is full of forgeries. In Gore's *New commentary pt. 1 p. 660* we find it stated that the Pentateuch was last written in the sixth century B. C. long after Moses, and it is stated by Rev. A. W. Oxford in the *Religious Systems of the World pp. 42-43*) that the Pentateuch was not written before the eighth or ninth century, B. C.

34. Further there are three old versions of the the old Testament, 1. the Hebrew, 2. Samaritan, 3. Septuagint. They differ in many important matters. One or two examples ought to suffice. The Hebrew Bible says that 1656 years elapsed between Adam's birth and the Deluge, the Samaritan and the Septuagint give 1307 and 2242 years for the same

interval. From the Deluge to the birth of Abraham 292 years elapsed according to the Hebrew copy, and 942 and 1172 years according to the Samaritan and Septuagint versions.

35. The Jews do not believe that the New Testament is a revealed book but this is the belief of all Christians. In what sense it is a revealed book I fail to understand. The Vedas were revealed by the god Brahma, the Old Testament contains several orders of God to Moses and his successors. So that it is partly a revealed book. The New Testament is a revealed book in the sense perhaps that it contains the sayings and orders of Jesus who has been raised to an equality with God, being composed of the same substance, (consubstantial) as if God is made of any substance, like the imponderable ether. I have failed, as already stated, to understand how the whole of the Old Testament (minus God's conversations and orders) can be said to be revealed nor do I understand how any book of the New Testament can be said to be revealed, and if revealed, by whom revealed, Jesus or the Evangelists?

36. In the case of the New Testament what do we find? Mathew's original gospel was in Hebrew, but the present one is in Greek. Mark's gospel is called "Memoirs of Peter" by Justin Martyr (100-120 A.D.). Luke's gospel is from hearsay and John's gospel is a forgery, according to Renan, *Life of Jesus* pp. 11-13. According to the Tübingen school founded by Baur the gospels and most of the epistles are not genuine. The three synoptic gospels were copies from an original source called Quelle which is not extant. In fact the synoptic gospels are in many places word for word the same and the sequence of the events narrated is

the same in all the three synoptic gospels, which shews that they are the work of the copyist and not of the apostles. All the gospels are called Gospels 'according' to Mathew, etc. and not Mathew's, etc., gospel. I have discussed this subject in my work "*Christianity—A Critical Study*" and so I do not wish to say more. As regards the gospels we do not know which sayings of Christ are genuine and which false. But in the case of the Koran, all the sayings in this book are undoubtedly Mahomed's. The Koran was written down by the amanuensis just as the words fell from Mahomed's lips, but in the case of Christ, he had no amanuensis, and the gospels were written long after Christ's death and so many errors must have crept in and the opportunities for forgeries were great, and as the evangelists had an interest in deifying Jesus, they put down many sayings and doings of Christ which they heard from others. Even the orthodox Christians now admit that several verses have been found to be forged. For instance *16 Mark 16*, the most important verse in the whole Bible, relating as it does to the salvation of mankind, has been omitted from the Revised Version. That verse is as follows, "He that believeth and it baptised shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be demned." This is also the opinion of the writer in *Gore's New Commentary* *vide* pt. 3, p. 123. So the sanction of the law against all heathens, as a lawyer would say, has been removed. There is another most important forgery recently discovered. In *5 (1 John) 7* we find these words in support of the doctrine of the Trinity. "For three are three that bare record in heaven, the Father, the word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one". This verse has also been omitted from the R. V.

Version, as spurious. Then there remain 28 Mat. 19, which also speaks of the Trinity. This and the next and concluding verse in Matthew have been "widely rejected". *Gore's New Commentary Pt. 3. p. 204.* So the basis of the doctrines of eternal damnation for heathens and of the Trinity has recently vanished. But in the case of the Koran, no such dispute about the text has ever arisen, and no man's salvation depends upon a spurious or doubtful verse, and nobody has quarrelled about the genuineness of the text of the Koran.

37. No one has doubted the existence of Mahomed. He fought battles and the Mahomedan era commences from his flight to Medina. He left a daughter whose son fought and died at Kerbala and his descendants, called Sayeds, are to be found in every Mahomedan country. He left a Koran which was published by his successor within two years of his death. So that he was a historical personage. But is Jesus a historical or a mythical person? As regards Jesus, his name was common among the Jews; for instance Joshua, the hero of the sixth book of the Old Testament, is the Greek form of Jesus. There is an apocryphal book called the wisdom of Jesus the son of Sirach, or Ecclesiastes. There is a Jeshua mentioned in 24 (1 Ch.) 1, and another in 31 (2 Ch.) 15. All these words have the same meaning, *i.e.* saviour. It appears that the name of Jesus occurs in heathen and Jewish histories and Christians rely upon this fact to prove his existence. Josephus (37-100 A. D.) mentions his name in his *Antiquities*, Bk. 18 Ch. 2 Sec. 3, and says Jesus was Christ. This passage not only mentions his name but says he rose on the third day. Renan in his *Life of Christ* says this passage is genu-

ine but retouched by a Christian hand, but Gibbon, Lardner, and others are of a different opinion. In fact this passage breaks the continuity of his history. Origen (185-253) says that Josephus does not mention the name of Christ. Eusebius, in the fourth century, first quotes this passage. If Josephus believed in the rising of Jesus and that he was Christ he should have been a Christian. This matter is very ably discussed by Mrs. Besant in her work on *Christianity p. 199 et seq., in Freethinker's Text Book*. Not one Jewish contemporary of Jesus mentions his name. The Roman historian Tacitus (55-117) mentions his name as Christus (*Annals XV. Sec. 44*). Tertullian (150-230) does not mention this passage. Even Eusebius does not mention it, and it first saw the light in the fifteenth century. Pliny the Younger (62-113) mentions the sect of Christians. Suetonius born 65 A.D. mentions this sect and says that Emperor Claudius (41-54) drove away the Jews from Rome as they, at the suggestion of one Chrestus, were constantly rioting out of Rome. See also *18 Acts 2*. For aught we know this Crestus may be the Jesus Christ of the Gospels. So we find some evidence from historians who wrote about 100 A.D. about the existence of a Christ, but no contemporary historian, Jewish or heathen, mentions his name. As to Buddha, there is no doubt of his being the heir apparent of a king, and there is contemporary history of his life and the narrative of his death and funeral is detailed in the *Great Decease, (Mahaparinibbana Sutta)*, which mentions the places where his relics were taken *Ch. 6 vs. 62-63* and some stupas containing them are still found in a dilapidated condition. No one has doubted the existence of Laotze, Confucius, Bud-

dha or Mahomed and they all died natural deaths. But Christ died a violent death, and nobody knows what he did after his so-called resurrection. The curious reader will find all the passages in Josephus Tacitus, Origen, Eusebius and other writers of the second century and onwards bearing upon this subject collected in the Appendix to the *Wars of the Jews* by Josephus published by Ward Lock & Co., pp. 252-261.

38. Recently a new theory has been started by Mr. Edwin Johnson in his book *The Rise of Christendom*, in which he says that these references to Jesus and the apostles in Josephus, Tacitus, Tertullian, Eusebius and others are all forgeries, committed by the Basilian and Benedictine monks in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. He says Eusebius did not write in the fourth century and Tertullian in the second. He says the Epistles of Pliny the younger to Trajan are all fabrications of the monks. He has cited many passages in Greek and Roman literature which were interpolated by these monks. He says that the legends went from Mecca to the Jews of Cordova and from Cordova these legends went to the monasteries of these monks. As the matter is too learnedly discussed for ordinary people I do not wish to say more on this subject except that the matter is very ably discussed by him, and that he has shewn great erudition and cited many passages from Greek and Latin authors and his conclusions are apparently sound, and if they are so, the legends regarding Christ are mostly false and his personality may be doubted. This is also the view of Dharendra Nath Chowdhury, who, in his very able and erudite work. *In Search of Jesus Christ*

has come to the conclusion that Jesus was a mythical person evolved out of pre-Jesus cults. He has torn Christianity into shreds and shown that most of Christ's sayings were taken from pre-Christian books. In fact, according to him, all the contents of the New Testament are forgeries. I advise all curious readers to read these two books, though I must warn them that the latter book is so full of quotations, that it is difficult reading and it requires great patience to go through the book.

CHAPTER I.

DOINGS OF MAHOMED.

1. The above are the general observations on the Koran. Now it is necessary to say something on the doings and sayings of Mahomed.

2. Mahomed was not a meek man like Christ or Buddha. He fought twenty-seven battles with the Meccans in many of which he was present, and it is said that he attacked their caravans thirty-eight times. It is said that he put to death seven hundred Jews of Koraidha who were originally his allies but had joined his enemies, the Koreish. "After a resistance of twenty-five days these Jews surrendered at discretion, trusting to the clemency of their old allies of Medina; they could not be ignorant that fanaticism obliterates the feelings of humanity. A venerable elder, to whose judgment they appealed, pronounced the sentence of their death: seven hundred Jews were dragged in chains to the market-place of the city; they descended alive into the grave prepared for their execution and burial; and the apostle beheld with an inflexible eye the slaughter of his helpless enemies." Gibbon Ch. 59 Vol. 9 P. 299. Mahomed married fifteen: wives besides possessing concubines, and he left nine widows. Gibbon says in reference to this that people of warm climates are very sensual. But he is wrong here. Till a few months before his Flight he had only one wife after whose death he began to be polygamous.

There are other matters connected with his life, mentioned in the Koran, but it is not necessary to mention all of them. I shall confine myself to three private matters in his life connected with women which shows his affection for them and which produced some important verses in the Koran.

3. One day he went to the house of Zeid, his freedman and amanuensis, in his absence, and there saw his wife, and was charmed with her beauty, and immediately a sura was revealed to him, enjoining marriage with her and he married her after getting a divorce, though she was the wife of his freedman whom he had adopted as a son, the result being that thenceforth there is no adoption among Mahomedans *Ch. 33 vs. 4, 37-38.*

4. One day, while Mahomed was returning from an expedition, Ayesha, his favourite wife, who had accompanied him, alighted from her camel on a private occasion. On her return, she missed her valuable necklace, and went in search of it. In the meantime her attendants, thinking she had entered her pavilion (tent), placed it on the camel and led it away. Their mistake was owing to its being night time. When she returned, she found her camel gone and expecting its return soon she fell asleep. In the morning she was discovered asleep and alone by one Safwan Ebn al Moattal, who had rested on the way at night. He waked her and she covered herself with her veil. She was made to ride on Safwan's camel; who walked behind and they reached Mohamed's camp at noon. Mahomed was in a perplexity for a month, as he could not stop the mouth of scandal. After that period *vs. 4 to 26 of Ch. 24* were revealed to

him, God calling the scandal a lie and ordering the punishment of the scandal-mongers.

5. On a day allotted to Hafsha, Mahomed lay with an Egyptian slave, Mary Copt, on Hafsha's own bed, during her absence. When Hafsha came to know this she became furious. To pacify her, Mahomed promised with an oath never to touch Mary any more. Sometime after, God revealed through him *Chapter 66* of the Koran, absolving him from his oaths. This chapter also contains some verses relating to the disclosure of the secret to Ayesha by Hafsha who had promised Mohamed to keep Mary Copts' affair a secret from every body, but which she had divulged to Ayesha.

6. These and several other verses about the private affairs and love intrigues of Mahomed look very suspicious. There have been similar events in the history of the world, but not one of them is mentioned by God in the Koran. It is said that the doctrine of predestination, which the Mahomedans believe, allowed God to write in the original Koran events which were to take place long after. In fact if God wrote the Koran or if it had co-existed with God from eternity there is nothing to prevent its recording future events, So there is nothing impossible in the Koran alluding to these events in the life of Mahomed. But that is not the question. The question is why should private affairs and love intrigues find a place in the semi-divine Koran. Many more important events had happened elsewhere but this book does not mention them. The story of Helen and Paris or other love intrigues that have taken place in the world find no place in the Koran. It looks as if Mahomed invented these verses to

for doing so, saying "O prophet, why holdest thou that to be prohibited which God had allowed thee, seeking to please thy wives?" This shows that God indirectly ordered him to take back Mary Copt, which he did with a vengeance, for not only did he divorce Hapsha which he afterwards retracted but separated himself from his other wives for a whole month, and spent that period in the apartment of Mary. *Ch. 66 vs. 1-2.* His oath was a good one, but when he felt that he could not live without Mary Copt, he brought forth these verses. All I can say is that God never could find fault with Mahomed's oath not to touch Mary Copt and never chided him for giving her up. Further, she was a slave, and why should God say that Mahomed's intercourse with Mary Copt was made lawful by Him, for it is moral adultery, and she, being his slave, could not refuse his embraces? So one cannot believe that God wrote these verses in the Koran or that God revealed these verses through Gabriel.

CHAPTER 2.

MAHOMED'S RELIGION.

1. Mahomedans call their religion Islam, which means surrender, and they divide their religion into two parts: 1. Faith and 2. Practice. Faith includes belief in God, in Mahomed's apostleship, in the angels, scriptures, the prophets, in resurrection and day of judgment. Practice consists in 1. prayer, 2. alms, 3. fasting and 4. pilgrimage. These are the principal matters which a Mahomedan believes. But Mahomed has uttered in the Koran many other things of minor importance, and I shall mention some of them.

2. The Koran has 114 chapters (suras) and though some of them are very small, there are some very long ones, the longest being the second chapter called the Cow, the first being called Fatihat or Introduction. This chapter is not chronologically the first but is said to be the quintessence of the whole Koran, the first five verses of Ch. 96 being the first revealed, and the last chapter is reckoned as the second best, and the reading of Chapter 67 will save a man from the torture of the sepulchre. The first chapter is a short prayer in praise of God like a rik (praise) of the Rig Veda of the Hindus. I quote it in full:—

Praise be to God, Lord of the worlds.

The compassionate, the merciful.

King of the day of reckoning.

Thee only do we worship, and to Thee do we cry for help.

Guide Thou us on the straight path.

The path of those to whom Thou hast been gracious :—

With whom Thou art not angry, and who go not astray.

In juxtaposition to 'this short prayer let me put the Lord's Prayer, 6 *Mat.* 9-13, (see also 11 *L.* 2-4).

9. After this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name.
10. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven.
11. Give us this day our daily bread.
12. And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors.
13. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For thine is the kingdom and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen.

The Revised Version has added the word "one" after "evil" and omitted the last sentence commencing from "For thine", which words are also omitted by Luke. Now if we compare the two prayers, we shall certainly give the preference to the Koran.

3. Now, what does Jesus mean by saying "Our Father which art in heaven?" Is heaven the sole or usual place of residence of God? Every believer in

the last sentence. But what does he mean by saying "lead us not into temptation." The Prayer in the Koran does not speak of bread or of debts. It is a simple prayer coming from the heart.

7. The Koran in the Medina verses repeatedly says "believe in God and the Apostle", "obey God and his Apostle" *Ch. 3 v. 29*, in other words the two words are often joined together, so much so that even in the matter of booty, "a fifth belongs to God and his Apostle", *Ch. 8 v 42, Ch. 59 v 7*. In fact the two words have been so much placed in juxtaposition in the Medina suras, that the present creed of Moslems is "there is no God but God and Mahomed in his prophet." That Mahomed was a prophet of God nobody can deny, but there was no necessity of using his name in the creed along with God's, as there were admittedly at least seven other prsphte mentioned in the Koran itself, *Ch. XI*, whom God sent unto men, besides Jesus. The fact is Moslem consider Mahomed the greatest prophct, superior even to Jesus, and hence his name is taken in conjunction with God's. In one solitary passage Mahomed goes to the extreme length of saying "Obey God and obey the apostle and those among you invested with authority", *Ch. 4 v 62*. All I wish to say on these passages is that God's name should stand alone and not in conjunction with other names.

8. There is no philosophy in the Koran, as Mahomed was illiterate and the Arabs never produced any philosopher before Mahomed's time. So Mahomed is almost silent as to God's attributes. Seven attributes of God according to Mahomedans, as Dr. Sell says, are (1) Life, (2) Knowledge, (3) Will (4) Power, (5) Hearing, (6) Seeing, (7) Speech. (vide

Al Kuran p. 39). The above seven attributes are all possessed by man and beast, only beasts cannot speak. As to the mode of God's speaking, it is mentioned in *Ch. 42 v. 50* that God speaks by vision or from behind a veil. But the Koran also says that God is perfect, *Ch. 67 v. 3*, omniscient, *Ch. 6 v. 59*, *Ch. 57 v. 3*, *Ch. 58, v. 8*, eternal, *Ch. 112 v. 2*, gracious, *Ch. 3 v. 28*, merciful, *Ch. 59 v. 22*, *Ch. 48 v. 14*, *Ch. 22 v. 19*, but I do not find the word omnipresent anywhere in the Koran. It must have been a slip of Mahomed. Jesus also does not use this word omnipresent. Dr. Sell says in *Al Kuran* p. 39 that God's holiness and love are not mentioned as God's attributes in the Koran. There is some truth in this latter observation as God orders the believers to shun the infidels, *Ch. 3 v. 114*, and other verses. But the words God's love for man are also not found in the four gospels as well, and as to this love the Koran and the gospels are equally silent. Jesus only orders his followers to love God, *22 Mat. 37*, *12 Mk. 30*, *33 10 L. 27*, taken from *19 Lev. 18*, *11 Deut. 1, 13, 22*, *19 Deut. 9*, and *30 Deut. 6*. As to the attribute of forgiveness, both of them agree in giving this attribute to God, *6 Mat. 12*, *Koran Ch. 9 v. 103*, and other verses. But God's forgiveness and mercy will be of no use as now Christ is the only person to forgive and he will decide our fate, and he said that he has the power to forgive sins and actually forgave the sins of the paralytic and of Mary Magdalene, *9 Mat. 2, 6*, *2 Mk. 5, 10*, *5 L. 20, 24*, *7 L. 47*. That God is merciful is admitted by both, *6 L. 12*, *Koran Ch. 9 v. 103*. This is an old idea, *34 Ex. 6* mentions it. As to God's omniscience Jesus is silent but Mahomed says God is omniscient. *Ch. 6*

the poor man will be thrown into the fire again *Ch. 4 v. 50*. All these horrible pains and penalties of the infidels have been taken from the Christians and the Parsees. *25 Mat. 41* speaks of "everlasting fire" to which Jesus will condemn the non-elect on the Last Day, and that fire will be the everlasting punishment of these people, *25 Mat. 46*. This chapter in Mathew is unique. There is no corresponding chapter in Mark or Luke, the other two synoptic gospels, but in *10 Mark 10*, now declared to be spurious. Vide *Gerr's New Commentary on Scripture, pt. 3 p. 130* we find that the non-believers will be condemned, though the period of the sentence is fortunately not stated. The result is that Mahomed nowhere says that God is love, and I should add that the God of the Christians whether God himself or Christ is not a loving God, when either one or both of them are ready to condemn the majority of mankind to eternal fire for the mistake of a lifetime. In this respect the Hindu and the Buddhist religions are much more logical and scientific. They say that men will be reborn after death and shall have time for correcting the errors of a past life, and so each man will have a *locus penitentie*, and reform himself and ultimately enjoy eternal bliss or get Nirmava. The word love nowhere occurs in the Koran in connection with God. Nor does the word Holy occur in such connection. My idea is that if God decrees that more than half of mankind will go to eternal hell fire, then such a God had better not exist at all as there is no love in Him. Further, such a decree altogether ignores the existence of men who lived and died before such a decree was passed through the New Testament or the Koran. V

the law take effect retrospectively, at the resurrection which has not yet taken place? But my reply will be that God should have given previous notice of his intention to pass such an order for the eternal damnation of infidels, so that the then existing people might have changed their views about religion. Mahomed's ancestors died before Mahomed promulgated the Koran which ordains eternal damnation for infidels. I ask what their fate will be on the Last Day? And similarly I may be permitted to ask what will be the fate of the ancestors of Jesus who never had an opportunity to hear him promulgate his religion. And what will be the fate of people who died very young, before they could speak or understand anything? If they are to go to hell for their non-belief in the Koran or Christ's divinity, then all I can say is that I have nothing to do with such a religion and I do not care for the God who will punish these infants.

10. As to belief in God, Mahomed says that God is only One. In this he agrees with the Jews but differs from the Christian Trinitarians who have added in the godhead Jesus, a man, though a superman, and another person, the Holy Ghost who came upon the scene for the first time with the writings of the evangelists, and whose only business is said to be, as far as one can understand, to lead a man to correct life, though Christ describes him as a Comforter whom he promised to send to his apostles after his death 16 / 7. The Upanishads also say there is only one God, *Akamebadityam* of the *Chandogya Upanishad* (6. 2. 1-2), which, owing to the numerous meanings of every Sanskrit word has been made to mean unity of God which is pure

Deism, and nothing exists but God which is pure Pantheism. But unfortunately the Hindūs have created an endless hierarchy of gods totalling 330,000,000, some of whom have separate functions. This doctrine of the Unity of God is the first and principal part of the religion of the Koran. The Christian's creed is the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man. As to the Father of God all the three Shemetic religions agree, though Moses has made God a visible God, who once dined with Abraham (*18 Gen. 1-8*), and Christians have divided God into three Beings with separate functions, like the Hindu Triad. As to this matter I need not say anything, as this belief does not lead to any action, being a mere mental idea, and so it affects only the state of mind of the believer, in other words, it is merely a subjective idea.

* 11. As regards the Brotherhood of Man, we find that Jesus never said any such thing. His words are "love thy neighbour as thyself". *22 Mat. 36-40*, *12 Mark 29-31*, and *10 L. 27*. Jesus took these words from *19 Lev. 18*, where the words are used for Jewish neighbours and permanent residents in the neighbourhood. I have fully discussed this matter in pages 58 to 61 of my work on Christianity, and I am glad to say that I have subsequently found the same view taken in Gore's *New Commentary on the Scripture Pl. 3. p. 185*. So it is an invention of the early Fathers that Jesus ever preached the doctrine of the Brotherhood of man. In the Koran, as in the two Testaments I find no such doctrine. In the Koran, Mahomed goes to the length of saying "form no intimacies among others than yourselves. They will not fail to corrupt you." *Ch. 3. v. 114*, "take

none of them (infidels) for friends" *Ch. 4. v. 91*. "Oh Believers, take not the Jews or Christians as friends" *Ch. 5. v. 56*. 'Oh Believers, make not friends of your fathers or your brethren if they love unbelief. *Ch. 9. v. 23*, this last verse reminding one of God's command to Moses that if thy brother, son, daughter, wife, or friend entice thee to idolatry, then "thou shalt surely kill him" and be the first to put him to death. *13 Deut. 6-9*. Jesus never said any such thing and the two Indian religions, particularly Buddhism, could not even dream of any such thing.

12. Jesus never uttered the word brotherhood. This word is not to be found in the four gospels, but even conceding that the religion preached by Jesus included the Brotherhood of Man, *i. e.* the whole human race, what has been the practice of the Christians from the time they got the upper hand in the Roman empire? Previous to that they loved themselves and lived among themselves and do not seem to have loved the heathens. But from Constantine's conversion up to date what is there to show that Christians love their Christian and heathen brothers? The Christians have been quarrelling amongst themselves since Constantine's conversion. There was a regular schism between the followers of Arius and Athanasius and the emperor once favoured Athanasius and then drove him away and invited Arius who had been driven away. In that very century Theodosius demolished heathen temples, abolished idolatry and passed severe laws against persons who would sacrifice to idols, and severely punished the Donatists. Within a hundred years the Roman empire fell and since then wars have been going on among the several Christian nations

of Europe, ending in the World War of yesterday. In fact Europe, inhabited by Christians only till 1453 and by Christians mostly after 1453 has always been an armed camp.

13. From the time of Theodosius in the latter part of the fourth century down to the end of the sixteenth century Christians have been guilty of waging religious wars and ordering persecutions against heretical followers of Christ. I do not wish to say what they have done to the heathens in foreign countries as I have treated this subject fully in chapters ten to twelve of my work "*Christianity, A Critical Study*". Hindus are idolatrous and Buddhists are atheists, but still their conduct towards humanity at large is much better than that of Mahomedan Deists and Christian Trinitarians, and it is a wonderful thing that the followers of the three Shemetic religions, who believe in one godhead, in which I include Christians, should be so intolerant as to kill unbelievers and sometimes followers of heretical sects, people who had as much right to follow their own religions beliefs as the followers of the dominant religion. To-day Christians have learnt to tolerate all forms of religious belief, but it took seventeen centuries to civilize the Christians in this respect and though Moslems have not yet fully come up to this level, and sometimes wantonly attack non-Moslems, still I have no doubt that within seventeen centuries from Mahomed's death they will be as tolerant as the Christians are to-day, and there will be no animosity between the followers of the several religions which prevail on earth.

14. The Albegensian heresy was suppressed by the Catholics with great cruelty, and the Holy

Inquisition was started in 1229, and the famous Spanish Inquisition was started in 1232, and began to act vigorously from 1480. Its procedure is described in the *Directorium Inquisitorium* of Eymerich, Inquisitor General of Castille in 1356. The accusers and the judges were the same persons and the riches of the condemned became the property of the Inquisition. Even the lawyer for the accused was selected by it. According to Llorente, the Spanish Inquisition up to 1809, when Napoleon suppressed it, burnt alive 31, 912 men, in effigy 17, 659, and imprisoned 341, 021. Buckle says that "according to contemporary and competent authorities, from fifty thousand to a hundred thousand persons were put to death in the Netherlands during his (Charles V) reign on account of their religious opinions". He says this figure is probably exaggerated. A man was liable to the death penalty for buying or selling or copying a heretical book, and the death penalty consisted in burning, beheading, or burying alive. *Hist. Civilization, Vol. 2, pp. 16-17.*

15. The Christians of the Dark Ages and the next two centuries condemned the work of Copernicus, killed Giorardo Bruno, tortured Galileo, the greatest man of his age and the founder of modern astronomy, and suppressed all attempts at discoveries in science. But it is the boast of Islam that it has never killed or tortured any scientific man nor stood in the way of discoveries in science, the fact being that the Mahomedans were during the Dark Ages the only people on earth who made any attempt at scientific discoveries, Christians being then principally concerned with the quarrels of the Schoolmen and with sectarian dogmas.

16. The spirit of the Inquisition appeared also in England where "between the years 1530 and 1603 two hundred thousand Englishmen were starved, executed, punished and imprisoned for their adherence to the old faith, Catholicism." F. Molloy, *Faiths of the Peoples*, 1892 Vol. i. p. 26. Mary burnt the Protestants and Elizabeth fined, tortured and put to death many Catholics. Hallam asserts that "the rack seldom stood idle in the Tower for all the latter part of Elizabeth's reign" (*Constitutional History: Elizabeth*, Ch. 3) and its very first month was stained by an intolerant statute. (*See Lingard, Vol. 7 pp. 244-5*), and Macaulay says that "Elizabeth, in his opinion, was little more than half a Protestant. She had professed, when it suited her, to be wholly a Catholic.....What can be said in defence of a ruler who is at once indifferent and intolerant?" (*Macaulay's Essays' Review of Nares' Memoirs of Lord Burleigh*).

17. It might be naturally expected that Christians would tolerate every form of belief. But the reverse was the rule. They suppressed the Arian heresy, the Albigensian heresy, and the Protestant heresy, and the Protestants of England suppressed the Catholic heresy. In the time of Elizabeth, Acts were passed to compel people to attend Protestant churches every Sunday, and fine and imprisonment were the punishments for not obeying the law. In the time of Charles II an Act of Uniformity was passed with the same object, which prescribed similar penalties for non-attendance in Protestant churches on Sundays. The object of these Acts was to compel Catholics to attend the churches of the Established Church. Historically the Christians were the first

to persecute heretics and to force their religion on others, and their example was followed by others. The Greeks, the Romans, the Hindus, Buddhists and Parsees did not force any man to follow their religion by fear of death or torture, and the example was first set by the followers of one of the meekest and loving of men. Such is the nature of man!

18. Outside Europe, America Australia and South Africa are also Christian countries. And we know what has become of the aborigines of these countries. The Inquisition forced the American Indians to become Christians through fear of the stake, the aborigines of Australia have been butchered, except in the waterless Western Territory, there are less than two hundred families of aborigines in New Zealand, and there are no aborigines in Tasmania as they have been extirpated. The extirpation of the aborigines of those countries was effected by the colonists who pretended to be Christians, which shows that the Sermon on the Mount did not stand in the way of these pseudo-Christians where self interest was concerned.

19. The above fully supports the theory that Christians follow the religion of Brotherhood, amongst themselves and also heathens! In America they had Negro Slavery till abolished in 1865 after a bloody war. But even now the American Whites do not allow the Negroes to travel in the same railway compartment with them, nor read in their schools. For the horrors of Negro Slavery I refer the reader to *Spears' American Slavery*, where he will find that the decks of the slavers were never more than four feet high, and when an English cutter was sighted, the slaver captain bound the slaves two and two toge-

ther and threw them into the sea, the captain thus getting rid of his slave cargo and preventing capture. The Christians of Europe showed their brotherly affection in the late war, when passenger and hospital ships were torpedoed and gas bombs were thrown into bodies of hostile troops. And this was done by people whose ancestors established the Reformation, the most refined form of Christianity.

20. Christians boast of their kindness towards other Christians and heathens. But was not Pizarro the most treacherous and the most cruel of men and was not he a devout Christian? The Inca of Peru came to see him on his invitation, and the moment he came to Pizarro's camp, a signal was given by Pizarro and his retinue of two thousand unarmed men were shot down and the Inca was made prisoner, and after extorting a ransom consisting of melted gold plate worth 1,750,000 sterling at that time the poor man was hanged for alleged conspiracy. And this Pizarro was a devout Christian, for when the conspirators fatally wounded him and he fell down, he crossed himself and cried Jesu which was his last word. (*Prescott's Conquest of Peru*) So even the best religion does not prevent a man from being the worst of men.

21. Christians say that they are civilized. That may or may not be. But all men past and present having descended from brutes are still mostly brutes, and I can only hope that after thousands of years man will be a semi-divine being. So my conclusion is, that man was, that man is, and that man will, for thousand of years, remain what his ancestors were, a brute but with a decent exterior. How otherwise shall I call a man who throws a gas bomb into the

midst of a hostile army and sinks a hospital ship ? And these men call themselves Christians.

22. Hinduism and Judaism are the most exclusive religions. These religions exist for their followers only. Though Jews sometimes initiate heathens into their religion, Hindus will never admit into their fold any one who is not born a Hindu. Even an untouchable Hindu cannot enter a temple. Buddha broke all barriers of caste and proclaimed a world religion and Buddhist missionaries have preached their religion throughout Asia and all Buddhists are of one fraternity. Christianity and Mahomedanism are also proselytising religions. But there is a material difference between these last two. Mahomedans regard all Mahomedans as members of one social order, irrespective of race, colour, class or nationality. But the Christians have divided themselves into different classes and care more for the colour, race and nationality of the individual Christian than the Mahomedans. A white Christian rarely thinks of marrying a coloured Christian. He will never sit at table with his Christian servant. But a white Mahomedan does not object to marry a black Mahomedan, and will dine with his servant sitting on the same carpet. Even Brahmins allow Kayastas and Baidyas to dine in the same room with them, though each guest is provided with a separate seat and a common carpet is never used. A king and his meanest subject will attend the same mosque and pray side by side, but in churches, every man of the upper classes has got his pew where others cannot sit. It thus appears that in matters of religion the Mahomedan is more social and democratic and the Christian exclusive. In fact there is very little of

the democratic spirit in religious and social matters among Christians. The Negro cannot attend the white man's school or church. There is thus a hatred of men of the same religion among Christians which is not to be found among the followers of Buddha or Mahomed. The Mahomedans are more bigotted than Christians, but the latter have shed off their bigotry within two or three centuries and I have no doubt that with the progress of education Mahomedans will do likewise.

23. Moslems have a Brotherhood of Moslems, irrespective of race, colour, and nationality, but the Christians, who say that Brotherhood of Man is part of their creed, have not even Brotherhood of Christians let alone mankind. The Protestants and the Catholics do not regard one another as brothers and the dark Christians are not regarded as brothers by the white Christians. The Negroes must have separate schools, railway compartments, and churches in America. The fact is, that excepting Buddhists no man regards the people of other countries or other races as his brother. So there is no Brotherhood of man in any of the Shemitic religions. One thing might be said in favour of the Moslems. They had no wars between them since a century and a half whilst Christians have been fighting against each other since the last three or four centuries ending in the World War. So there is more Brotherhood among Moslems than among Christians, but neither of them have any pretension to Brotherhood of Man. As long as the Christians love to fight among themselves let them not speak of Brotherhood of Man.

24. Mahomed was very angry with infidels,

including Jews and Christians. He said in *Ch. 3 v. 114*, *Ch. 4 vs. 62, 91, 102*. *Ch. 5 v. 56*, that his followers should never make friends with the infidels as "the infidels are your undoubted enemies" *Ch. 4 v. 102*. So this religion can never be called the religion of Humanity. It is a misfortune that excepting Buddha, Zeno the Stoic and Comte, no founder of any religion has based his religion upon the 'Brotherhood' of Man. Christ never preached this doctrine, his 'Brother' was the Jew as I have shown in a previous page and Bishop Gore's New Commentary on the Bible (*Pt. 3 p. 185*) agrees with this view. As I have stated my views on this matter more fully in my work on *Christianity pp. 58-59* and also in a previous page of this book I do not wish to say anything more on this subject.

25. Mahomed's next important doctrine is regarding Heaven and Hell. The believers will go to heaven and unbelievers to hell. This doctrine of Paradise for believers and fighters for the cause of God was dinned unto the ears of the Moslems as it continually occurs in the *Koran. Ch. 2 vs. 59, 149. Ch. 3 vs. 103, 162-64, Ch. 4 v. 60, Ch. 5 vs. 162-64, Ch. 9 vs. 73, 112, Ch. 39 v. 73* and other verses. The unbelievers are to go to hell and suffer from eternal fire, *Ch. 2 v. 156, Ch. 3 vs. 79, 102, 272, Ch. 4 v. 59, Ch. 9 v. 34 (for ever) Ch. 9 vs. 17, 74, Ch. 14 vs. 19-20, Ch. 15 v. 44, Ch. 17 v. 74* and other verses.

26. Mahomed took his ideas of heaven and hell from the Jews who admit that they took their own ideas about them from the Persians. The *Koran* says that heaven and earth were a solid mass afterwards separated. *Ch. 21 v. 31*. "On the Last

Day shall the heaven with its clouds be cleft and the angels will be sent down descending." *Ch. 25 v. 27, Ch. 69 v. 17*. What is meant by the heaven being cleft I fail to understand. Mahomed thought that it is now a solid mass like the earth but formerly both the heavens and earth formed one solid mass afterwards separated, each constituting a separate solid mass, the heaven having a roof, *Ch. 21 v. 32*.

27. Regarding heaven and earth the Koran says that there are seven heavens and seven earths, *Ch. 2 v. 27, Ch. 17 v. 46, Ch. 23 v. 17, Ch. 41 v. 11 Ch. 65 v. 12, and Ch. 41 v. 11* says that the heaven was created in two days. The idea of there being seven heavens is a Jewish idea. Mahomed seems to have borrowed this idea from the Jews. The Jews believed that the lowest heaven was not very far from the earth. It was so near that Adam could touch the bottom of the lowest heaven with his head. It was Adam's fall which dwarfed him in size. (see *Myths and Legends of Ancient Israel Vol. I pp. 19-22*) Unfortunately for us we can see but one heaven even with the aid of the best telescope and that heaven is not a solid mass but ethereal space dotted with stars, nor can we see the seven earths mentioned in the Koran. Does the Koran refer to the planets? In that case even it is wrong, because there are at least eight big planets including the earth besides the smaller planets numbering more than a hundred discovered since 1808 between the earth and Mars. Recently a new planet was sighted beyond Neptune. The fact is that the Jews and the Arabs were illiterate and they knew little of Astronomy, and hence it is not strange that there should be this mistake in Astronomy. Therefore the question arises whether the Koran with

these mistakes could be the work of an all-knowing God and the answer is obvious. The Koran is silent as to the number of hells, but the hell has seven portals; *Ch. 15 v. 44*.

28. As to the existence of seven heavens it seems that the Jews and the Arabs were not singular in their belief. Parsees also believed in seven heavens. I should think that the Jews got this idea from the Parsees during their captivity and Mahomed got this idea from them. The Slavonic Enoch and the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs also speak of the seven heavens. (*Myths and Legends of Ancient Israel Vo. I. p. 19*) Hindus also believe in the existence of seven heavens (Mandal) the upper-most of which is the residence of the chief god Indra with the celestial damsels and the celestial garden with the tree which can gratify any wish of any being.

29. As to the enjoyments in heaven, Paradise, Moslems were told of their nature in very glowing terms. In fact Paradise is described in many suras, viz, *Ch. 4 v. 60, Ch. 7 vs. 44-45, Ch. 9 v. 73 Ch. 35 v. 30, Ch. 36 vs. 52-57, Ch. 37 vs. 38-47, Ch. 36 vs. 113-39* and other suras, and the most vivid and enticing description of Paradise is to be found in *Chapter 55 vs. 46-97*. The last mentioned sura says that there are two gardens with overbranching trees, two fountains, two kinds of fruits, virgin damsels with retiring glances, and there are other gardens with fountains, fruits, beautiful virgins etc. The greatest enjoyment in heaven, though in a negative sense, will be perfect ease as "therein no toil shall reach us and therein no weariness shall touch us" *Ch. 35 v. 32*, but this verse does not say whether ennui will seize the blessed, which is worse than toil or weariness.

30. In some verses, Mahomed says that these virgins though they will be spouses of the faithful, will always remain virgins and look young *Ch. 36 vs. 35-36*. The latter is possible, but how can a spouse intended for the enjoyment of her lover always remain a virgin? This passes one's comprehension. These spouses will be perhaps specially created for the male believers for nowhere do we find any mention of the spouses of the female believers. The male believers will get new spouses, but what will their earthly wives get after resurrection? Will they be without any male companions, as they will not get their husbands who will prefer these most beautiful and youthful virgins for themselves, to whom they will stick and give up their previous wives? This is a difficulty which I am unable to solve, and I hope some Moslem divines will try to solve my difficulty. As regards the male believers they will always remain thirty years old. Mahomed got these houris from the Persians and the ideas of Heaven, Hell and the Bridge over hell also from them as previously stated.

31. The believers will be able to get delicious fruits in heaven and drink pure fountain or stream water. Though a Moslem is not allowed to take wine in his mundane existence, as it is strictly forbidden by the Koran *Ch. 2 v. 216, Ch. 5 v. 93*, yet in heaven he will find rivers of wine and of milk *Ch. 47 v. 16*.

32. Nowhere does the Koran refer to any prepared dish in heaven, whether of meat, fish, or vegetable, or even of rice, or wheat or any other cereal. Only fruits and milk are to be had in heaven to satisfy one's appetite and water and wine to quench the thirst. The fruits are to come from the over

branching' trees, *Ch. 55 v. 48*, and milk from rivers of milk. But it is not stated what animals will yield this milk, for if the animals would fill this river with milk, what is there to prevent the eating of their flesh?

33. Mahomed was illiterate as he himself admits *Ch. 7 v. 156*. So he had no idea of any intellectual pleasure in reading good books and conducting discussions on learned subjects. His whole idea of heaven consisted of the enjoyment of sensual pleasures, and there is absolutely no mention of any intellectual pleasure, not even any of the belles lettres. Such a heaven would be very monotonous to its residents, and the sensual pleasures would pall upon the senses, after some time.

34. Jesus also does not say a word as to intellectual pleasures in heaven. If Mahomed was totally illiterate as he himself admits *Ch. 7 v. 158*, Jesus was very nearly so, like the other Jews, as his learning was doubted by his hearers, *7 J. 15*. So both fail to mention intellectual pleasures in heaven. Mahomed speaks of eating and other sensual pleasures. Jesus speaks only of eating in heaven with apostles, *22 L. 30*. This is the only reference in the New Testament as to what the apostles will do in the next world and there is no mention even of what others will do after resurrection. The elect will "inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world" *25 Mat. 34*, the non-elect to go "to everlasting punishment" *25 Mat. 46*.

35. However, Mahomed's description of heaven is something tangible. The Jews did not at first believe in a future state, and so never thought of existence after death either in heaven or hell. Jesus

no doubt believed in resurrection after death, he himself having, it is said, risen from the dead. *But he is almost silent as to the state of the blessed. Only Luke and John say something which relates to this subject, the other evangelists being totally silent. Jesus told the apostles "in my Father's house are many mansions, if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am therein ye may be also". 14 *J.* 2-3. In another place Jesus told the apostles, "And I appoint unto you a kingdom as my Father hath appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel". 22 *J.* 29-30. The difference between Christ and Mahomed in this matter is that Mahomed is definite in his statements and description of heaven, but Jesus is very vague and is totally silent as to the state of others besides the twelve apostles. What becomes after death Jesus does not say. What becomes after the resurrection and the trial of the good and bad is totally left in the dark, the only passage bearing upon this point is in 25 *Mat.* 34, wherein Jesus says that the elect "will inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world" a most vague passage, and Gore's New Commentary on the Holy Scripture does not give any key to the meaning of this passage, the fact being that it is meaningless and unusually vague. It appears that there is no corresponding chapter in Mark or Luke, and the whole of 25 *Mat.* appears to be entirely spurious.

36. Mahomed is more realistic and practical

than Jesus. The latter said that the Kingdom of God was nigh. Mahomed also said that the Resurrection was nigh, *Ch. 20 v. 15*, with the believers' entry into heaven, which he graphically describes in several suras. But Christ did no such thing. Jesus appointed a kingdom for his apostles where they "may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom" *22 L. 29-30*. Christ being a bachelor did not think of houris in heaven. Mahomed speaks of fruits in heaven but of no meat or vegetables. Christ is silent as to what his apostles will eat with him in his kingdom, but his apostle John has supplied the omission. John's disciple was Polycarp, martyred in Smyrna, and Polycarp's disciple was Irenaeus, who says as follows: "John related the words of the Lord concerning the times of the kingdom of God: the days would come when vines would grow, each with 10,000 shoots, and to each shoot 10,000 branches, and to each branch 10,000 twigs, and to each twig 10,000 clusters, and to each cluster 10,000 grapes, and each grape which is crushed will yield twenty-five measures of wine. And when one of the saints will reach after one of these clusters, another will cry: 'I am a better cluster than it; take me, and praise the Lord because of me.' Likewise, a grain of wheat will produce 10,000 ears, each ear 10,000 grains, each grain ten pounds of fine white flour. Other fruits, and seeds, and herbs in proportion. The whole brute creation, feeding on such things as the earth brings forth, will become sociable and peaceable together, and subject to man with all humility" (*Iren. Haer.*, "vs., 33, 34, as quoted in Keim's *Jesus of Nazara*," p. 45). This shows that Christ like Mahomed was for eating fruits only in heaven. The

ded. Paul relying on faith, Jesus and James on works, Mahomed solely on a man's merit. The Christians rely on works, faith and grace, and they have come to the conclusion that the grace of God through Lord Jesus will save a man, a meaningless expression, as it requires God's grace plus Christ's intercession for a man's salvation, so that the united actions of God and Christ are necessary. The *Bhagavat Geeta* says Faith, Works (Vedic works) and Knowledge (of God) are the three ways of salvation, the last being a pure Hindu idea.

38. As to the fate of the unbelievers it is well known that Heathens and Kafirs will go to hell and there suffer from eternal hell fire, 25 *Mat.* 46 and *Koran Ch. 3 vs. 112, 156* and other suras, and each time a new skin will form they will be pushed back into the fire *Ch. 4 v. 59*. Upon this matter I may observe that these verses make God cruel.

39. The Koran is silent as to the state of the soul between death and resurrection. Christ is similarly silent on this subject. There is a solitary passage in 23 *L. 43* which says that Jesus told one of the malefactors nailed close to him "today shalt thou be with me in paradise". If this man went to paradise just after his death, the theories of resurrection and of Jesus' Second Advent vanish. It is very strange that Mahomed has given a glowing picture of Heaven and a very dismal picture of Hell but is totally silent upon the state of the blessed or the cursed after their death and before the resurrection. This is a difficult matter not tackled by any founder of religion.

40. As to the Resurrection and Last Day or Day of Judgment, the Mahomedans believe that the

time when it will take place is a perfect secret known only to God. Even Gabriel professed not to know it when asked by Mahomed. But certain signs will follow when it will be near. These signs are divided into lesser and greater signs. The lesser ones are (1) Decay of faith among men, (2) The advancing of the meanest persons to eminent dignity, (3) A maidservant will be the mother of her mistress (or master) which means an excess of sensuality, (4) Tumults and seditions (as in the Bible, *24 Mat. 13 Mark. 14 Luke*), (5) A war with the Turks, (6) Great distress in the world, (7) Irak and Syria will refuse to pay tribute, and (8) The buildings of Medina will reach to Ahab or Yahah. The greater signs are :— (1) The sun will rise in the west, (2) The appearance of the beast which will rise out of the earth in the temple of Mecca, or Mount Safa, or Tayef or some other place. This beast will be sixty cubits high, but they say that its head will reach the heaven. It will have the head of a bull, the eyes of a hog and have other organs of other beasts. It will speak Arabic. It will strike all believers with the rod of Moses, and mark them with the word Mumen 'believer' and all infidels will be branded with the word Cafer. (3) War with the Greeks and the taking of Constantinople by 70,000 of the posterity of Isaac. The walls of the city will fall down when they will cry out "There is no God but God, God is most great". When dividing the spoils, news will come of the arrival of Antichrist when they will leave all and return back. (4) The coming of Antichrist, an one eyed Cafer. He will ride on an ass and 70,000 Jews of Ispahan will follow him. He will remain on earth forty days but one of these days will be as

long as a year, another as a month, another as a week and the rest will be common days. He will lay waste all places, but will not be able to enter Mecca or Medina, which will be guarded by angels. Jesus will ultimately slay him. (5) The coming of Jesus who will be converted to Islam, marry a wife, beget children, kill Anti-Christ and die after forty years, or twenty-four according to some. During his stay there will be great security and plenty on earth, no hatred or malice and beasts of prey will live in peace with cattle and a child will play with serpents. (6) War with the Jews, when there will be a great slaughter of them by the Moslems. (7) The eruption of Gog and Magog, of whom many things are related in Chapters 18 and 21 of the Koran. These barbarians will distress Jesus and his companions and will be ultimately destroyed by God. (8) A smoke which will fill the earth. (9) An eclipse of the moon. (10) The returning of the Arabs to the worship of Allat and Al Uzza, and their other ancient idols. (11) The discovery of a vast heap of gold by the retreating of the Euphrates. (12) The demolition of the Caaba. (13) The speaking of beasts and inanimate things. (14) The appearance of a descendant of Kabtan. (15) Breaking out of fire in Hejaz. (16) The coming of the Mahdi, or director. His name will be Mahomed and his father's name will be the same as that of Mahomed's father. He will fill the earth with righteousness. (17) A wind which will sweep away the souls of all who have a particle of faith in them. *Salh, Prel : Dis. pp. 62-64.*)

41. These events will precede the resurrection, the hour of which is uncertain, but it will be heralded

by the sound of the first blast of the trumpet which will be sounded three times. The first blast will shake the foundations of the earth, throw down mountains, melt the heavens, darken the sun, cause the stars to fall, on the death of the angels who keep them suspended in space, the sea will be troubled and will dry up, women nursing their infants will abandon them. After the second blast all living creatures will die, except those whom God exempts from this fate. The last to die will be the angel of death, which is very natural, as he will have no work to do, and his existence will be perfectly useless. The third blast will be sounded after forty years. It is called the blast of resurrection, when the angel Israfil standing on the rock of the temple of Jerusalem, will call all dry bones and dispersed parts of the bodies of the dead, including the hair, to judgment. This angel will by trumpet sound call all souls, which will be thrown into his trumpet and at the last sound of the trumpet, these souls will fly out from the trumpet, and will, like bees, fill the space between heaven and earth, and then go into their respective bodies, which the earth will give up, and Mahomed will be the first to arise. This re-birth will be caused by an incessant rain for forty years. (*Sale Prel : Dis. p. 65*)

42. The Day of Judgment will be a very long one. In one place the Koran says it will last 1000 years *Ch. 32 v. 4* and in another place *Ch. 70 v. 4*, the period is extended to 50,000 years. The men who will rise from the graves will be perfect, just as they came out of their mothers' womb, naked and uncircumcised. Mahomed said many other things about the Resurrection, they are of minor importance,

who was born in 10 B. C. was the foremost. The Saracens have produced very few philosophers, of whom A. Gazali is the greatest. In fact with the exception of Paul's writings no philosophy appears in the two Testaments or in the Koran. The Koran does not say whether God is omnipresent or not. If He is omnipresent then how can He appear, as He is everywhere, in Heaven and Hell, though their pleasure and pain may not touch Him. In *Ch. 20* *v. 2* the Koran says, God ascended the throne after creation of the Heavens and the earth. This shows that the throne was vacant before God's ascension. God's omnipresence is never expressly asserted in the Koran. Now if God be omnipresent He cannot 'appear' anywhere.

45. As regards the idea of Resurrection and the Day of Judgment and all that is to take place before and on that occasion, Mahomed is indebted for them to Christ who got them from the Persians, but Christ is totally silent regarding the details of events which are to happen on that most important day nor the state of the dead before resurrection. The advent of Gog and Magog in the Koran is taken from *20 Revelation 8*. The ideas of the convulsion of nature which will shake the foundations of the world and that the sun and the moon will be darkened and the stars begin to fall, of the coming of Anti-Christ and Christ-coming in the clouds of heaven, which the angels accompanying him are to announce by trumpet call are mainly taken from the Bible, *24 Mat. 13 Mark, and 21 Luke*. In the above chapters Jesus is made to say that he will try mankind, and in *25 Mat. 34* Jesus says he will tell the elect to "inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world" which

is heaven, and the non-elect will go to eternal hell fire *v. 46*. The division of the resurrected into the elect who will have the Book in the right hand, *Ch. 69 v. 19, Ch. 84 v. 7*, and the condemned who will have the Book in their left hand *Ch. 69 v. 25* or behind their back *Ch. 84 v. 10*, was probably taken from *25 Mat. v. 34 and 41*, where Christ places the resurrected elect on his right and the condemned on the left. The ancient Jews had no idea of resurrection. The word resurrection does not occur in the Old Testament and Jesus borrowed this idea from the Persians, who probably got it from the Egyptians, who were a much older people and who believed in resurrection, (*Egypt and the Egyptians p. 41*) and who also believed that the judgment takes place immediately after death and the blessed are arranged on the right hand of Osiris and the wicked on the left who are taken to the dark regions of the underworld, (*ibid p. 40*). *Herodotus i, ii, c. 123* says that the Egyptians believed in resurrection and they therefore mummified the bodies of the dead, that the soul might come back hereafter. *Gibbon in Ch. 50 Vol. 9, p. 274* follows him and says that this doctrine was first entertained by the Egyptians.

46. Though Mahomed says that the hour of the Resurrection and Last Day is uncertain, still Mahomed says that "verily the hour is coming" *Ch. 20 v. 15*, "It is nigh" *Ch. 17 v. 53*. This hastened conversions, and Jesus also said that the kingdom of heaven is at hand *4 Mat. 17, 8 Mat. 11, 1 Mat. 7, 24 Mat. 17* and though he could not foretell the exact hour of his coming in the clouds to judge mankind, *24 Mat. 37-42*, yet he said that this will happen in the lifetime of the 'present' generation, and

"some standing here shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." 16 *Mat.* 28, 23 *Mat.* 36, 24 *Mat.* 34-35, 9 *Mk.* 1, 13 *Mk.* 30-31, 9 *L.* 27, 21 *L.* 23-33, 5 *J.* 25-28, (hour is coming and now is) 4 (*1 Thess*) 15-17, 5 *James* 8 (*nigh*), 4 (*1 Pet.*) 7, (*at hand*). Reformers say that the end of the world is coming soon, so all should make haste to be converts. Many people have been disappointed and the expected Final Day has never come though many hundreds of years have passed and the expected day will never come soon as this world is expected to last some millions of years. Notwithstanding the predictions of Jesus and Mahomed, the last day will not come within millions of years. The earth is some millions of years old and it will last some millions of years more.

47. Mahomed tries to prove resurrection by the analogy of the resurrection of the dead earth by rain, *Ch.* 16 v. 67, *Ch.* 23 v. 5, *Ch.* 43 v. 10, and the resurrection of the sun which dies every night *Ch.* 3 v. 26, *Ch.* 36 v. 37. This was also the argument of St. Clement, the fourth Bishop of Rome, in his *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, *Sec.* 24, in which he speaks of the revival of the dead seed and of the dead sun. But he added one very strong argument, and it was the resurrection of the Phoenix from its dead bones after every 500 years, *Secs.* 24 and 25. This tale of the Phoenix is also told by Tertullian and Cyril of Jerusalem. It is a case of real resurrection of a dead body which once was alive. This story furnishes the best argument for resurrection, as the Phoenix was a bird with life and it died and was revived after 500 years, but the dry earth or seed or the sun was not a living being.

48. 'As regards the Book registering men's actions which will be produced on the last day, *Ch. 17 v. 14-15* this idea is taken from the Jews, and the ideas of the balance *Ch. 23 v. 104* and the sharp edged bridge were taken from the Persians and the Jews, and the ideas of heaven and hell were taken from the Persians through the Jews. Dr. Sell says that the idea of the balance to weigh men's actions, *Ch. 23 v. 104* is an ancient Egyptian idea. It is found in an apocryphal work which was translated into Arabic which describes the weighing of souls. But *Sale (Prel. Dis. p. 70)* says that the balance is mentioned by old Jewish writers. However, Dr. Sell is supported by Bevan who says in p. 40 of his *Egypt and the Egyptian*, that the ancient Egyptians believed that after death the heart of the recently deceased was weighed in a pair of scales. See also *Hand Book for Egypt and the Sudan* pp. 90-91. So both of them are correct. The Jews took this idea from the Persians, who took it from the ancient Egyptians.

49. The unity of God and the reward of the believers in heaven and the eternal punishment of the unbelievers in hell where "as oft as their skins shall be well burnt we will change them for fresh skins, that they taste the torment", *Ch. 4 v. 59*, are, I should say, the leading ideas in the Koran, the others are subsidiary, being only means to the grand end.

50. The other important doctrines of Mahomedanism are:—(1) Predestination, (2) Prayer, (3) Giving of alms, (4) Fasting, (5) Pilgrimage to Mecca, (6) Last day.

51. Predestination is mentioned in *Ch. 17 v. 14*, "And every man's fate have we fastened about his

neck and on the day of resurrection will we 'bring forth to him a book which will be produced to him wide open." *Ch. 6 v. 2* : "He it is who created you of clay—then decreed the term of your life : and with him is another prefixed term for the resurrection. Yet have ye doubts thereof ! *Ch. 64 v. 2* : "It is He who hath created you and one of you is predestined to be an unbeliever, and another of you is predestined to be a believer." (Sale's translation).

52. Now, if I am predestined to be an unbeliever, and if my fate is fastened about my neck and every action of mine had been recorded in the Book lying on God's table from eternity, no effort of mine can alter my fate, and no effort of mine can change my actions and conduct in this world, as they had been already recorded in the Book and that Book cannot be changed by whatever I might do. Under these circumstances how can I be held responsible for my actions ? Whatever I might do, however good my conduct may be, I am bound to go to hell.

53. This doctrine raises a very important question. On the one hand God knows and knew from eternity what I shall do and nothing contrary can happen because that would militate against God's foreknowledge. On the other hand, this theory makes a man a mere automaton. He is a puppet in the stage of this world as he must do willy or nilly what God knew beforehand, and Mahomed is perfectly justified in saying that all human actions were written in a book from eternity because God is eternal and his foreknowledge is eternal, and the word book may be merely metaphorical and nothing practical turns upon it.

54. On the other hand, if a man becomes a mere

automaton, he should not be made liable to any punishment as he has no freedom of choice.

55. Most people believe theoretically in fate but I have never been able to find a man who practically believes in it and models his actions upon that belief. If a tiger comes to attack a man he is sure to fly to avoid being killed. If a man's child falls ill he is sure to send for a doctor. These and similar actions on the part of a man show that he has no faith in fate. Strictly speaking, a believer in fate should not move at all, and should not do any action. He should be absolutely motionless because motion means work and work is always intended to undo the effect of some events, to promote some good, or ward off some evil, but as no action of man can alter what has already been decreed by God, a man's interference is absolutely useless. In other words, a believer in fate should not feel any necessity for any action, which from his point of view is absolutely unnecessary, and cannot change anything pre-ordained by God. In other words his action cannot be either good or bad as they are not actually his action, as he is forced to act by his fate and his action had been pre-ordained by God.

56. It might be argued that my punishment for a particular action is part of the decreed fate. That may be so, but this punishment, though decreed by God from eternity, I never deserved as I was a mere automaton not responsible for any action. I am punished because God wills, and not for any fault of mine, as I do not break any commandment of law, but do the act complained of as God's agent, as the act must be done by me, having been ordained by God, and if I do not do the act, were it possible, I would be breaking the law of God or disobeying God's order, or

acting contrary to His order. So this theory of predestination leads us to a dilemma. God has written my fate, I do the pre-ordained act, which is murder. I cannot do otherwise, as fate binds me, still I am liable to punishment by God and man for this act of murder. If I try to disobey God then I commit a sin, and I am liable to punishment, if I do what God wills, then also I am liable to punishment. The idea of punishing a man for doing what God wills him to do by His foreknowledge is revolting to all ideas of propriety. Further suppose I am fated to go to hell as a non-believer, then all attempts to make me a believer either by persuasion or by force are not only useless but criminal, as trying to frustrate God's wish, *Ch. 64 v. 2.*

57. The idea of predestination is common to many nations. The ancients believed in unalterable fate. The Greeks had their Fates. The Christians have also believe in predestination. This idea is found for the first time in the New Testament in St. Paul's writings, *8 Rom. 29, 30, 1 Eph. 5, 11, 1 (1 Pet.) 12*, and St. Paul seems to be the only apostle besides Peter who mentions this word as he was the only learned man among the apostles. This word predestination used in the Authorised Version has been changed in the Revised Version into the word foreordain, both coming from the Greek word *proorizo* (of our horizon) which means defining or delimiting beforehand. This idea is also found in the Hindu religion. Every Hindu believes that on the sixth day after birth the god Brahma comes to see the new born babe at night and writes his fortune on his forehead. For this reason the infant is not allowed to lie on his bed at night and sleeps on the lap of some one, who must

be awake the whole might, so that Brahma may not take away the child, vide my work on *Hindu Customs in Bengal*, pp. 14-16. This doctrine of fate followed by all eastern nations has paralysed their energies. When they fall into any serious difficulty, they do not strive to overcome it or to better their fortune after severe loss, thinking that it is useless to strive against fate.

58. Another important doctrine of Mahomedanism is the obligation to pray. In *Ch. 17 vs. 80, 81* Mahomed says:—"Observe prayer at sunset, till the first darkening of the night, and the daybreak reading for the daybreak reading hath its witness. And watch unto it in the night: this shall be an excess in service it may be that thy Lord will raise thee to a glorious station: *Ch. 20 v. 130*: "Put up then with what they say and celebrate the praise of thy Lord before the sunrise, and before its setting; and sometime in the night do thou praise Him, and in the extremes of the day, that thou haply mayest please Him". There are other verses relating to prayer, *Ch. 9 v. 114*, which orders the believer not to pray for idolaters, and *Ch. 4 v. 102* which advises Mahomed to cut short the prayer in time of war. The usual custom among Mahomedans is to pray five times in the day, which according to Mahomedans and Jews alike begins at sunset, as according to the Bible day came into existence after night, when God said let there be light and it was light, I Gen. 3. These five times are 1 Sunset, 2. night, 3 day break, 4, a little after noon, and 5, midday, between noon and nightfall, *Ch. 20 v. 130*. Mahomed thought prayer to be so necessary a duty that he used to call it the Pillar of Religion and the Key of Paradise and on one occasion when the Thakifites begged him to be

allowed to dispense with prayer at the appointed times he answered that "there could be no good in that religion wherein was no prayer."

59. The Jews pray with their faces towards the temple of Jerusalem which has been their *Kebla* from the time it was built by Solomon and it was also the *Kebla* of Mahomed and his followers for six or seven months if not more. Afterwards he changed the *Kebla* to Caaba, *Ch. 2 vs. 139, 144, 145*. Mahomed's explanation of this change was that it was God's wish. At one time he had gone to the length of saying, *Ch. 2 vs. 109*, that "the East and the West are God's. Therefore whichever way ye turn there is the face of God." But Mahomed as just stated abrogated all these. This is not a solitary instance of abrogation. There are not less than 225 abrogations in the Koran, which show that the Koran cannot be a divine Book for God's mind can never change, but Mahomed could and did change his mind to suit his own purpose.

60. Before commencing to pray a believer is enjoined to wash his head, face, hands and feet and to be personally clean. If no water is available then sand is to be used instead, *Ch. 5 v. 8*. A man should not be gaudily dressed nor very shabbily dressed. These ideas about purifications were taken from the Jews who are also ordered to pray three times a day. The several postures used by the Mahomedans in their prayers are also the same with those prescribed by the Jewish Rabbins who ordered the devotees to prostrate themselves so as to touch the ground with their foreheads. The Jews and Sabians had to pray three times a day, at morning, noon and evening. The Sabians have three prostrations at each

adoration, the Moslems have also their prostrations.

61. As regards angels, Mahomed often mentions them in the Koran. There are good and bad angels. Among the good angles Gabriel is the chief. He brought down the Koran in parcels to Mahomed. Among the bad angels Eblis or Satan of the Jews and Persians is the chief. His name is often mentioned in the Koran. This idea of Mahomed about angels is taken from the Jews who admit that the names and offices of angles were borrowed by them from the Persians. The fact is that the Jews lost most of their books during their long Captivity and they took many ideas from the Persians. As regards these angels, Mahomed says that at the battle of Beder which he won with a handful of men against a much larger army of the Meccans, it could not have been won against such odds but for the kind assistance of God in sending down 3000 angels to Mahomed's assistance and they fought on his behalf and turned the scale of victory *Ch. 3 vs. 11, 119, 121. Ch. 8 vs. 9-10.* After the defeat of Mahomed at Ohod the next year God promised to send 5000 angels.

62. Gabriel was the principal good angel, and Eblis was the principal bad angel as just stated. It appears that when God created man, He ordered the angels to worship him. Gabriel and others obeyed the order, but Eblis and his followers declined to worship Adam. God ordered Eblis and his companions to go to hell but on his entreaties agreed to allow him to remain among Adam and his descendants till resurrection to enable him to deceive mankind, and God granted his request and gave him the respite to deceive man which caused Adam's fall, *Ch. 2 vs. 27-34, Ch. 7 vs. 10 et seq.*

Ch. 17 vs. 63 et seq., Ch. 18 v. 48, Ch. 38 v. 81. The Revelation of John has a similar idea but the fate of Eblis or Satan is not the same as that described in the Koran, as the Revelation in *Ch. 20 vs. 1-3, 7*, makes Satan first go to hell and live there 1000 years, to be released after that period. But now that the 1000 years have passed, Satan has come back and is giving us lots of trouble.

63. As to the giving of alms the Koran enjoins it in *Ch. 2 vs. 211, 269, 278, 277. Ch. 64 vs. 16, 17*, says the loan to God will be doubled hereafter, which idea is also found in *Ch. 30. v. 38*. Alms are to be given of 1. cattle, 2. money, 3 corn, 4. fruits, 5 wares sold. The fortieth part of this is to be given away in alms, *Sal. Prel. Dis. 86*, which is exactly the precept of Bhuddha. Jesus also says "when thou makest a feast call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind" *14 L. 13*. "You will be blest and get your reward at the resurrection", *14 L. 14*; which is the same thing as getting your loan doubled hereafter. This is also the Jewish idea and the Jews highly extol the giving of alms. As to the Hindus, no orthodox Hindu will refuse a handful of rice to a beggar. But Christians are not willing to support beggars. They will give something to public charity, but usually give nothing to individual beggars. Hospitality and giving some alms to the beggar are, I believe, confined to Asiatics, and practically unknown to the people of Europe. In England begging in a public place is punishable. They have work-houses maintained by Poor Boards where the poor may lodge and eat, but they will have to work. Nothing is given for doing nothing, which is the real meaning of alms.

64. Fasting is also enjoined to the believers in

the month of Ramadan (Ramjan) *Ch. 2 v. 179-183*. The month of Ramadan was selected as the Koran was sent down by God in that month. The fast is observed in the daytime and a believer can eat or drink at night till he can discern a white thread from a black thread, *Ch. 2 v. 183*. This fast is very trying during the summer months, when the days are long and thirst for water is very great and the tongue and lips become parched. A believer cannot swallow his spittle nor bathe. A man is permitted to approach his wife during this month of fast. To discern a white thread from a black thread in a moon light night is very easy if a man goes out into the open. If the verse means that one should try to discern inside a room, then even in the daytime it may be possible so to darken it that it will be very difficult to discern a white thread from a dark one. The verse should have been explicit upon this point.

65. Mahomed did not know that in the arctic and antartic zones, the days are very long, sometimes lasting for months, and one can always discern a white thread from a black thread. So no believer in these two zones can take any nourishment or quench his thirst at any time during these months. What then will be the fate of the believers in those regions Mahomed's ignorance of foreign countries has made the observance of certain rules very trying. A man has to leave his shoes and socks five times a day and wash the feet and hands up to the elbow before prayer. This is very trying to the inhabitants of colder climates. Mahomed never dreamt that his religion would be spread as it has done and if the Saracens could defeat Charles the Hammer at the battle of Tours in 732, then according to Gibbon the whole

of Europe would have been converted to Mahomedanism. Almost the same result would have happened if Sobieski had not defeated the Turks near the walls of Vienna. So I think that Mahomed addressed his Koran to the Arabs only and not to foreigners. His boast that the original Koran is written in the Arabic tongue for the Arabs also strengthens my belief, *Ch. 41 v. 44, Ch. 43 v. 2,*

61. The Jews also had their fasts, which are ordained in *16 Lev. 29, 31, 52 Jer. 6, 13, 25 (2 K.) 8, 9, 25, 41 Jer 1-2, 25 (2 K.) 1, 52 Jer. 4, 8, Zech. 19, 20.* The Jews ordered the fasting for mourning for the dead *31 (1 Sam.) 13, 1 (2 Sam.) 12,* with distress and sorrow, *20 Judg. 26, 1 (1 Sam.) 7, 20 (2 Sam.) 34, 1 Neh 4, 35 Ps. 13,* with expressions of penitence, *9 Deut. 18, 7 (1 Sam.) 6. 21 (1 K.) 27, 10 Ez. 6, 9 Neh. 1, 69 Ps. 10. 3 Jon. 5.* The Pharisees fasted twice in the week, *18 L. 12,* on Mondays and Thursdays. The Gentile Christians also had their fasts, *13 Acts. 2, 14 Acts. 23.* Paul is against giving an independent value to fasting, *14 Rom. 2, 16, 17, 21, 2 Col. 2, 16-23, 4 (1 Tim.) 3-5, 8, 5 (1 Tim.) 23.* In *17 Mat. 21, 9 Mark 29, 7 (1 Cor.) 5,* fasting is omitted in the best manuscripts, the result being that the Authorized Version has the word fasting in all the above three verses, and the Revised Version omits entirely the first verse and omits the word fasting in the other two. The Hindus observe fasting to an extreme. In West Bengal no respectable Hindu widow can eat or drink anything on the eleventh day of moon, and if a widow dies on that day, Ganges water is poured down her ear and not her throat. The Sabians fasted three times a year, once for thirty days, then for nine days and lastly for seven days.

62. The next important matter in the Koran is the obligation to go on a pilgrimage to Mecca. The Koran says that the temple of Caaba was the first temple erected by man and was built by Abraham, *Ch. 3 vs. 90-91*, and God appointed it as a place of pilgrimage, *Ch. 2 vs. 193-194, Ch. 22 vs. 28-30*. Diodorus Siculus, who flourished in the first century B. C. mentions Caaba as the oldest and most honoured temple in his time. This pilgrimage is obligatory upon all Mahomedans. In Mahomed's time it was not very difficult to go to Mecca from distant parts of Arabia, and in fact the Aarbs did go there, as it was, even before Mahomed's time, a reputed place of pilgrimage and the district was holy. Mahomed broke the idols which disgraced the temple, and people now go there, circuit the temple, bathe in the adjoining well Zem-Zem and kiss the sacred stone, said to have fallen from heaven which is most probably true, as it is a meteorite, and Abraham erected a temple there and placed the stone in it. Tradition says that this stone fell with Adam from heaven, after Adam's fall, when he was driven away from heaven where the garden of Eden was situated. The temple is 24 cubits in length, 23 cubits in breadth and its height is 27 cubits. Mahomed could not abolish the pilgrimage as that would have given offence to the Meccans. *Salc Prel. Dis. Ch. 4 pp. 89-95* also *Gibbon Ch. 50, Vol. 9, pp. 241-6*, for a fuller description of the temple and of the rites and ceremonies connected with pilgrimage. These rites at the temple savour of idolatry. For instance, why should the black stone be kissed? It does not matter that it fell from heaven with Adam. It is after all a stone, an inanimate object, and

cannot do any good. But Mahomed found the custom prevalent since a long time and he did not abolish it.

63. The Koran says, *Ch. 95 v. 3*, that the soil of Mecca is inviolate soil. This is true, Meccan territory is sacred. Its area is 37 miles in circumference and is called Haram, vide *Pliny VI, 32*. It had the privilege of asylum, and no commerce could be carried within its limits and it could not be inhabited by any one. The sacredness of this territory was miraculously proved by the failure of the expedition of Abraha, the Christian king of Abyssinia and Arabia Felix, who marched towards Mecca with a large army in order to capture it in the year of Mahomed's birth. His army was attacked by small pox and destroyed and this was the first visitation of that malady in Arabia. This expedition is referred in *chapter 105* particularly *vs. 1 & 4*.

64. As to the pilgrimage to Mecca we find the idea of pilgrimage in all countries. On festival occasions all the people assemble before a reputed shrine. The Jews repaired to the temple of Jerusalem and Jesus went there every year. The Hindus go to all well known places of pilgrimage on some solemn occasion. In February 1930 nearly four and half millions of Hindus met at Allahabad to bathe in the confluence of the Ganges and the Jamuna. Mahomed by instituting the pilgrimage to Mecca has served a double purpose. It has pleased the Meccans and brought great wealth to his birth place by the concourse of pilgrims, besides establishing the supremacy of Mecca over all other Mahomedan cities.

CHAPTER III.

MAHOMED'S PRECEPTS.

1. The above is the doctrinal religion of Mahomed and the practices enjoined by him which every Mahomedan is to observe daily or yearly in his life. He has given some other precepts in the Koran which are very important and should be mentioned.

2. Before his flight the Medina Mahomed was well disposed towards the Meccans. He preached toleration and said there must be no compulsion in religion *Ch. 2 v. 257*. But after his flight to Medina Mahomed was so disgusted with the Meccan idolaters that he orders his followers to fight against the idolaters, and to kill them all *Ch. 2 vs. 187, 189, Ch. 9 vs. 5, 9, 36, 39, 74, Ch. 47 vs. 4-5. Ch. 66 v. 9*. The Mahomedans are not to be aggressors, but if attacked, then they must fight to a finish, until the worship of one God is established. At first Mahomed ordered his followers not to attack in the sacred months, but afterwards he ordered them to attack the infidels even in the sacred months, *Ch. 9 vs. 5, 36*, and he says in *Ch. 47 vs. 4-5* "When ye encounter the infidels, strike off their heads till ye have made a great slaughter among them, and of the rest make fast the fetters, and afterwards let there either be free dismissals or ransoms till the war hath laid down its burdens. These do". In *Ch. 2 vs. 187, 189*, the Moslems are ordered to kill the infidels who attack them "wherever ye shall find them" and to fight against them till the only worship be that of one God. In *Ch. 8 vs. 39, 40*, God says that if the infidels return to unbelief "fight then

against them till the strife be at an end and the religion be all of it God's. In one place Mahomed enjoins his followers to lay in ambush for the infidels and when they came unawares to kill them. He ends Ch. 2, the biggest chapter by asking God to give victory over all infidel nations: "thou art our protector, give us victory therefore over all infidel nations" (*Ch. 2 v. 286*).

3. Regarding toleration Mahomed's verses in support of it are *Ch. 2 v. 257*, *Ch. 16 v. 129*, *Ch. 45 v. 15*, *Ch. 50 v. 39*, *Ch. 88 v. 21* etc., and it is a most unfortunate thing that the man who could utter such noble ideas could abrogate these verses and preach war to a finish against the infidels, *Ch. 2 v. 189*. Among Christians there was no such thing as toleration during the Dark Ages, as heretics, who differed only in matters of dogma were burnt to death. Even Luther and Calvin "asserted the right of the magistrate to punish heretics with death", *Gibbon Vol. 10 p. 182*, *Ch. 54*; and in the next century there were only three men in the whole of Europe, all laymen, to defend toleration, Bayle, Leibnitz and Locke, *p. 183*. Such is religious bigotry. I am sometimes tempted to think that as Mahomed abolished idolatry, so another reformer should come forward to abolish religion itself, as it has in the long run done more harm to mankind than good, and even in these days of partial toleration, millions of men are spending their time uselessly after the search for "The unknown and unknowable." The Upanishads, and all writers on religion admit that God is unknowable. Mahomed is silent about this matter but tradition says that in his night journey (*Ch. 17*) he was taken to God whom he saw. Christ says "I speak what I

have seen with my Father", 9 J. 5. "The world hath not known Thee, but I have known Thee" 17 J. 28 So that ordinary mortals cannot know God, but only Jesus knew Him. This is on account of his Sonship. I have stated above that John's gospel is a forgery. Mr. Edwin Johnson, in his *Rise of Christendom*, has shown that the Basilian and Benedictine monks forged many books in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries and interpolated passages in many genuine books. If John's gospel be admitted for argument's sake to be genuine, still I have no doubt that these two verses were interpolated by the monks. Now even Christ admits that we mortals cannot know God. Then why quarrel about religion and spend lots of time to enquire about God's nature and spend a large portion of your time and substance to please Him by flattery as if God is very fond of it, as we are ?

4. As to killing prisoners and making slaves of the spared, the Koran follows the Jewish law, 20 *Deut* 10-15, in which God orders Moses to kill all captives and make all the women and children slaves, and take possession as booty all the cattle and goods of the vanquished. I fail to see why God should give such dangerous and inhuman advice to his chosen people or to Mahomed. If He were to give such advice to-day, men would wonder, and cry down the man through whom God spoke thus.

5. As to general precepts to the Arabs, Mahomed forbade infanticide *Ch. 16 v. 60-1*. This was a great advance among the Arabs. Formerly Spartans and other people exposed their new born weakly babes to be devoured by birds and beasts. This was the

law of Lycurgus, as Plutarch says, and Plato in his *Republic* has a similar idea. Strabo was astonished to find the absence of this custom among the Egyptians, *Strabo L. 17*), who reared all their children. In India this custom of infanticide was prevalent among the Rajputs, who killed their infant daughters and an Act has been passed to stop it.

6. The drinking of wine or spirits is absolutely prohibited. *Ch. 2 v. 216, Ch. 5 v. 93*. But some imagine that excess of drinking only is prohibited and that the moderate use of wine is allowed by the Koran. *Ch. 2 v. 216*. But the general opinion is that Mahomed has totally prohibited the use of wine. This is the opinion of most of the Sunnees, whereas the Shias and the Turks put a more liberal interpretation and permit moderate drinking. This prohibition relates only to our mundane existence, as wine is permitted in heaven, *Ch. 76 v. 5* where there will be rivers of wine *Ch. 47 v. 10*. Manouchi says that in Mahomedan countries taverns were forbidden by law and that when Akbar engaged some Englishmen for his artillery he had to give them permission to prepare wine. (*History of the Mogul Empire pp. 136-137*). He says that Akbar allowed his European gunners to plant vineyards about Agra for preparing wine. This ordinance was inserted in the Chronicle with this preamble, "Wine is as natural to Europeans, as water to fish, and to forbid the use of it is in effect depriving "them of life." This explains the difference between the habits of Mahomedans and Christians.

7. Mahomed prohibited these intoxicants on account of their ill effects as they lead to quarrels and neglect of religious duties. *Ch. 2 v. 216. Ch. 4 v. 46, Ch. 5 v. 93*. For these reasons the Jewish priests

were forbidden to drink wine when they entered the tabernacle, 10 *Lev.* 9 and the Nazarites, 6 *Num.* 3, and Rechabites, 35 *Jer.* 5-6, and many pious persons among the Jews and primitive Christians wholly abstained from them; nay some of the latter went so far as to condemn the use of wine as sinful. It is strange that Christ nowhere prohibits the use of wine. In fact he is almost silent as to the use of wine. Only in two places the use of wine is mentioned in the New Testament, the first being the conversion by Jesus of water into wine at a marriage feast at Cana, 2 *J.* 1-11 the second being the offer of wine by Jesus to his apostles at the Last Supper. 26 *Mat.* 27, 28, 14 *Mk.* 23, 24, 22 *L.* 20., John being silent upon this matter. Among civilized peoples Christians seem to be more addicted to wine and spirits than either Hindus, Mahomedans or Buddhists. No doubt ancient Hindus were very fond of wine, Soma being one of their principal gods, the fermented liquor produced from the juice of the Soma plant being the principle drink of the ancient Hindus. An entire Mandala of the *Rig Veda* consisting of 114 hymns viz., No. 9 is, with the exception of one hymn, devoted to the praise of Soma. In hymn 96 vs. 5, 6 of that Mandala the god Soma is called the Father of the Holy hymns, (*Rig Veda*) and of Earth, Heaven, Agni, Sun, and of Vishnu, and is described as the Brahman of the gods. There are also constant references to it in the other Mandalas. In the *Rig Veda Samhita* a hymn occurs which shows that wine was kept in leather bottles and freely sold to all comers. Afterwards the use of wine was prohibited, and Manu orders that molten lead is to be poured down the throat

of the wine seller who is an out-caste to-day. Unfortunately for Bengal, it has become the centre of Tantric rites, and therefore high caste Bengalees consume more liquor than similar people in other parts of India, where no Brahmin would tolerate it. Buddhists do not allow the use of wine as Buddha includes the avoidance of wine in one of the Noble Eightfold Paths (*Arya Dharma of Dharma-sala* g. 217).

8. The strict Mahomedans have not only tabooed wine but they abstain from coffee and tobacco though most Mahomedans take coffee and smoke tobacco. The same is the case with opium, which the more rigid Mahomedans do not take.

9. Games of chance, statues and lotteries are prohibited by the Koran in the same passages and for the same reasons as wine, *Ch. 2 v. 216, Ch. 5 vs. 92-93*. Chess is almost the only game which the Mahomedan doctors allow to believers as lawful, because there is more of skill than of chance in it. But still some strict Mahomedans prohibit it. It appears that this game was recently introduced into Arabia and not long before into Persia whither it was first brought from India in the reign of Khosru Nushirwan at about the time of Mahomed's birth. Sale says that chess was invented in the time of Justinian, but I believe he is wrong as it was invented in India. Christian monks for sometime were not allowed even chess, and as to Jews they also highly disapprove gaming, gamesters being severely censured in the Talmud and their testimony declared invalid. In India gaming with dice was very common and is still common. This brought about

the war of Kurukshetra and the decimation of the warrior caste, but it appears that some people condemned gaming, vide *10 Rig. Veda* 34, which condemns gaming with dice.

10. Mahomed prohibits usury, *Ch. 2 v. 276, Ch. 3 v. 125*, following the Jews who were strictly prohibited from taking any usury amongst themselves though allowed to do so in their dealings with people of a different religion, *25 Lev. 36-37, 23 Deut. 19, 20, 18 Ezek. 8, 13, 17*. This prohibition of usury among the Jews is not followed by them. They began to practise it during their Captivity and they are reputed to be the most usurious people. The Egyptians could not demand any interest exceeding the principal. The Hindu law was similar, and the law of Damdupat is still followed by some courts in British India. As regards the Christians, although they show lip loyalty to the Pentateuch and the rest of the Bible, they never pretend to follow the prohibition of usury in the Bible, and are always investing their money at interest. But the Mahomedans are very strict in this respect. They rarely lend at interest. Whatever spare money they have must be kept in a chest or invested in business. They will not deposit in a bank for safe custody as banks allow interest. Now if a man has a large amount of money in his chest he will either invest it in lands or trade, or spend it, lest the money be stolen by thieves, and if a Mahomedan does not like the trouble of managing a big estate or looking after a business, he spends the money after luxuries. This is the cause of the poverty of the Mahomedans as compared with the Hindus.

11. As to meat Mahomed follows very nearly

the Jewish law except that besides the flesh of some animals and birds mentioned in *11 Lev.* the flesh of the camel, which is prohibited among the Jews, *11 Lev. 4.* is not prohibited among the Moslems, *Koran Ch. 2 v. 168, Ch. 5 v. 4, Ch. 6 v. 118.* The Jews and the Hindus agree in this respect, as the camel is the only ruminant whose flesh may not be taken by the Hindus, *Manu Ch. 5 v. 18.* According to Medhatithy, one of the best commentators of *Manu*, this verse allows the Hindus to eat beef. In fact beef was lawful food of the Hindus from before the Vedic times, and it was only at a much later date that the slaughter of kine was prohibited and the cow relegated to the position of a divinity. It appears that since the time of *Mahabharata* the meat of the cow became unlawful food. The whole subject is very ably dealt with by the late Raja Rajendra Lal Mitra in his *Indo Aryans, Chapter on Beef in Ancient India.* The Jews burnt most of the fat of the sacrificed animals and thus wasted it, *1 Lev. 9, 12, 17, 3 Lev. 3, 4 etc. 4 Lev. 8-12* but the Hindus and Mahomedans never do so. The Jews and orthodox Hindus will not eat the flesh of any animal which has not been sacrificed in the name of God or an idol, and the Mahomedans like the Hindus and the Jews do not take the meat of any animal which has not been sacrificed in the name of God. *Koran Ch. 5 v. 4. Ch. 6 v. 118, 121. Ch. 22 v. 37. Ch. 2 v. 168, Ch. 16 v. 116.* Why this dedication of the sacrifice to God or idol I fail to understand. All food comes from God, then why dedicate the animal to God and not dedicate the fish and the vegetables to Him? Mahomed says that the flesh or blood cannot reach God "but piety on your part reacheth Him". *Ch.*

22 v. 38. Why this unnecessary piety? Hindus are logical in this respect and the Christians too. Before putting a morsel of food into their mouth they recite some mantra or words of grace as thanksgiving to God or some idol. But the Koran is silent as to this matter. The Hindus believe that the idol partakes of the flesh of the victim and they eat the *prosad*, the remnant. This shews that the Hindus are more logical and practical, but the Koranic explanation is useless. The Jews believe that if they eat part of the sacrifice there is communion with God and the eater. Among the Hindus "the sacrifice is as the means of obtaining power over this and the other world, over visible as well as invisible beings, animate as well as inanimate creatures". *Dr. Haug's Introduction to Aitereya Brahmana pp. 73-74.* The sacrifice brings about the fructification of desires and this world was created as the result of sacrifice performed by God. The human sacrifice was performed for the attainment of supremacy over all created beings. The Jews were ordered to sacrifice to God. God ordered Abraham to sacrifice his son Isaac to Him. The Jews were very fond of sacrifice. It is stated that on the occasion of the dedication of the Temple, Solomon sacrificed 22,000 oxen and 120,000 sheep. 7 (2 *Chro*) 5. The Christians also believe that blood purges everything. St. Paul says in 9 *Hebrews* 22 that "almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission". And they regard the crucifixion of Christ as the greatest sacrifice and his blood will save mankind from the effects of the Original Sin.

12. As regards other animals and birds, the

Mahomedans are taught to avoid pork, like the Jews, *Koran Ch. 5 v. 4, Ch. 6 v. 118, 11 Lev. 7.* As regards the hare God prohibits it to the Jews on the ground that it chew the cud, *11 Lev. 6, 14 Deut. 7*, but the fact is that this animal is not a ruminant, and so Moses has put a wrong reason in God's head, showing God's ignorance of zoology. The hare has the habit of constantly moving its jaws about, and this misled Moses, who has put this erroneous idea into God's head. It won't do to say that the word in the Hebrew text translated as hare refers to some other animal, as the Hebrew word for hare is the same as the present word for it in the Arabic language.

13. Not only Mahomedans but Jews, Hindus and Christians, *16 Acts, 29, 21 Acts, 25 Koran Ch. 2 v. 175, Ch. 5 v. 2* abhor drinking the blood of animals, or the flesh of any animal which dies of itself or is killed by another animal and so cannot be killed by man. So the injunction to avoid such meats is common to all civilized people. As to Buddhists, meat of all animals is prohibited to them, but I understand that some Buddhists eat the flesh of dead animals, and Dr. Waddell in his work on the *Expedition to Poonchuland* says that the Lamas kill the Tibetan ox called yak and take its flesh.

14. As regards fish, Moslems are allowed to eat the fish of the sea or the river, *Ch. 5 v. 97.* They therefore avoid the tortoise, turtle, and the oyster and strict Moslems avoid the shrimp, as these fishes, not having any bony structure, are invertebrates like worms.

15. As regards civil matters Mahomed began to legislate after his Flight. The thief had to lose

his right hand *Ch. 5 v. 42*. The whore and whore-monger were to get a hundred stripes *Ch. 24 v. 2*, but in another place, the punishment is stated to consist of being shut up in a room till death relieves the woman *Ch. 4 v. 19*. As for adultery the punishment is stoning. This punishment for adultery is taken probably from the Jews, *20 Lev. 10, 20 Deut. 22*. In fact all ancient people often punished adultery with death. In modern times the punishment is very slight. In India the man is punished with imprisonment and fine and the woman is not punished, whereas in Europe or America there is no punishment for either party, only the man has to pay damages to the injured husband. The death penalty for the adulteress was the law since the institution of marriage. The oldest extant code of law on earth, the Code of Hammurabi, composed in 2000 B. C. *section 129*, punished the adulterer and the adulteress with death and orders (*section 153*) the murderess of the husband to be impaled, vide the code of Hammurabi in *First of Empires, Ch. 8*. The laws of the Koran are also very strict. Besides the law for the punishment of the thief and the adulteress, there is a general law for all offences. It is called *Lex talionis* "life for life, an eye for an eye, etc.," *Ch. 5 v. 49*, taken from *21 Ex. 23-27*.

16. The Koran legislated regarding marriage, divorce, inheritance and other civil matters, but they are to be found in any book on Mahomedan law, and form no part of religion strictly so called. It is enough to state that the believer can marry up to four wives and possess as "many slaves as his right hand may possess" *Ch. 4 v. 3*, but in the case of Mahomed God allowed him a special privilege. He could

every country in the world that a man only could divorce his wife but the wife could not divorce her husband except for cruelty and misconduct. Only among Buddhists the right to divorce was mutual. In England, after the Great War, men and women have been placed on an equality in the matter of divorce. According to the Mahomedan law the husband can at any time divorce his wife without assigning any reason. The fact is that at the time when Mahomed promulgated his laws no one ever dreamt of equality between the sexes. People say that Mahomedanism is a democratic religion. To a great extent it is. But as regards the two sexes, Mahomed makes great distinction between them. As already stated the wife cannot divorce her husband but the husband can divorce his wife at his sweet will, and as regards inheritance a brother always gets a share double of that of the sister. Another defect in the Mahomedan law is that as regards inheritance the law makes no distinction between the children of a married wife and those of a slave girl or a concubine. This is opposed to all systems of law prevailing in civilized countries. The worst part of the thing is that the laws laid down in the Koran are like those of the Medes and Persians, unchangeable, for the very simple reason that they are contained in a book written by God before the creation of the world, and so no human being has a right to reverse or alter the laws of God. All nations on earth excepting the Moslems have changed their laws and their calendar, but Mahomedans have not been able to alter them. Therefore the laws of the Koran, civil and criminal, are still in force in every Mahomedan country. In India the personal law of the Mahomedans regard-

ing marriage, divorce, inheritance, and gift is still in force, but the British Indian Government does not allow the Mahomedan criminal law to prevail in India and therefore a thief's right hand is not cut nor an adulteress put to death. Under European influence Turkey and Egypt have introduced many changes in their laws and customs which are opposed to the Koran. For instance Turkey has introduced the Gregorian calendar and abolished the lunar calendar which God had established in the Koran, but the rest of the Mohomedan countries are still very orthodox and are opposed to any change in the law laid down by the Koran. Half a century ago a Mahomedan convert to Christianity was executed in Constantinople by order of Sultan Abdul Hamid notwithstanding the protest of the British ambassador, as apostacy is a capital offence *Ch. 4. v. 91*. Christians could be forced or persuaded to be Mahomedans and the Mahomedans are always trying to convert other people into their religion. These converts were gladly taken by Mahomed into his fold. Therefore one fails to see why an apostate Christian would be welcomed and an apostate Mohomedan put to death.

18. Whatever one might say about the Mahomedan law of inheritance, it is far better than the Hindu law on the subject, whether prevailing in Bengal, where the sons exclude every body else and no female, except the widow or daughter can ever inherit any property, or in the Benares School where the brother living in commensality excludes everybody except the sons. The Koran distributes the property among the widows and children, male and female, though the son gets a double share of that of the daughter. But no near female relative is ever excluded. In this

respect the Bengal school of law is the worst offender. It excludes the sister, the son's daughter and all females except the widow and the married daughter or a widowed daughter having sons, so that a sonless widow cannot inherit. Fortunately the legislature has altered the law on this subject and has admitted the right of these females. But that was about half a dozen years ago. But Mahomed has made a great omission in his legislation. Every system of law lays down the rule of succession to the king. Mahomed is absolutely silent on this subject. In his dying moments he ordered a small debt to be repaid and offered prayers to God, so that he was in full possession of his senses up to the last moment, and was conscious of his approaching end. Still he did not nominate his successor, nor lay down any rule regarding succession to the Caliphate, the result being that his second, third and fourth successors, Omar, Othman and Ali fell victims to the dagger of the assassin, and of the two sons of Ali, the first, Hassan was poisoned, and the second, Hossein, lost his life at the battle of Kerbela after terrible sufferings, which event is commemorated every year by all Mahomedans specially the Shias. This omission of Mahomed has caused many thousands of tons of blood to be spilled for possession of the throne, as here the only rule of succession to the throne is Might is Right.

19. Jesus is absolutely silent about slavery. Paul is also silent. He only sent a fugitive slave to his master with a letter of recommendation for mercy, *Philemon*. But Mahomed has legalised slavery. Prisoners of war, as previously stated, are to be killed or made slaves. A Mahomedan can

have 4 wives only, but he can have union with any number of his slaves which the Koran sanctions.

Ch. 4 v. 3. No doubt a Mahomedan is not permitted to commit rape upon his slave. Why should slavery be allowed at all? The fact is formerly no one thought that slavery was a bad institution and Christians fought to uphold slavery in the sixties of the last century. Mahomed says that if a slave is manumitted and he asks for a deed of manumission; then give him one and give him also a portion of your wealth to start life, *Ch. 24 v. 33*. In the same verse he says force not your female slaves, but if you do, God will be forgiving and merciful to them, but he does not say what punishment will overtake the wrong doer. That slavery is a bad institution will be admitted by all, though civilized America had a terrible Civil War over it in the sixties of the last century. But one form of slavery will exist for ever, in the form of sweating labour and exploitation of the weak. Now slavery is nearly abolished in all civilized countries including Mahomedan countries. But having Mahomedan slaves as concubines is morally still worse, as one can have any number of them for his own use, *Ch. 4 v. 3*. Gibbon says that "the seraglio of Caliph Abdulrahman, his wives, concubines and black eunuchs, amounted to 6, 300 persons," *Ch. 52, Vol. 10, p. 38*, and every big Mahomedan potentate had a big seraglio of wives and concubines, generally slaves, and in *Ch. 4 v. 3*, Mahomed allowed four wives and unlimited number of slaves to each faithful.

20. Mahomedans are all circumcised. The Koran does not mention this word but as the Arabs were circumcised, the Mahomedans follow their example.

The Arabs got this practice from the Jews, who adopted it during their long sojourn in Egypt, where this rite was practised. It forms no part of a religious rite among the Mahomedans, it is only a custom followed by them. But it was a religious rite among the Jews as Abraham was ordered by God to practise it, *17 Gen. 9-14*, this being the condition imposed by God for His covenant to Abraham and his seed for ever that they would possess all the land of Canaan, a promise which has been frustrated by Sargon, Nebuchadnezzar, and successive conquerors. In fact since the conquest of Palestine by them up to date no descendant of Abraham, excepting the Maccabees, ever ruled in Palestine, and their dynasty lasted only a century. Herod's family no doubt ruled over Judea for some time but they were not of the seed of Abraham, his ancestors being Idumean converts to Judaism and they were satraps appointed by Rome.

21. The above explains why the Jews always observe the ceremony. Abraham was ordered to circumcise every male child on the eighth day, and so Jesus was circumcised on the eighth day, *2 L. 21*. After his death a dispute arose as to whether the uncircumcised Gentiles could be baptised and brought into the fold of Christians, *15 Acts. 1-6* and after a long and heated discussion, *15 Acts. 7-21*, it was decided that no circumcision was necessary in the case of the Gentiles but that they should abstain from meat offered to idols, blood, things strangled and fornication, *15 Acts. 22-29*. Now the Jews and Mahomedans are the only people in the world who are circumcised.

22. Mahomed had two remarkable theories

about the birth and death of Jesus. As regards Christ's birth, he says in *Ch. 19 v. 16* et seq, that Christ's birth was immaculate, a miracle brought about by the angel Gabriel, whom God had sent as a messenger to Mary. The Mahomedans, according to Sale, say that Gabriel blew into the bosom of her shift which he opened with his fingers and his breath reaching her womb caused conception "into whose womb we breathed of our spirit," *Ch. 21 v. 91, Ch. 66 v. 12*. If any man can introduce air into the womb of a woman her death will be instantaneous but it was otherwise in Mary's case as it was all a miracle. The evangelists are silent as to how Mary conceived, but the Mahomedans have supplied the omission. As this event was a miracle, an act of God himself, we cannot go behind it and deny the occurrence. As to whether miracles can happen I must refer the reader to Hume's celebrated Essay on Miracles and the works of Leckey and Wallace, and if the reader so condescends, he can read the chapter on Miracles in my work on *Christianity*. But though Mahomed, like all ancients, believed in miracles, he himself refused to perform any miracle, *Ch. 3 vs. 179-180*, alleging as a ground for refusal that previous apostles who had performed miracles were called liars.

23. As to the crucifixion of Jesus, Mahomed says something strange. He says that the real Christ was not crucified but his substitute was, *Ch. 4 v. 156*. But we find a contrary verse, *Ch. 3 v. 48*. However the first verse obviates the necessity of explaining his resurrection. This is a new theory, not confirmed by any Christian or heathen writer and, perhaps copied from some apocryphal gospel. Perhaps the best explanation would have been that Jesus was

not in 'fact' dead, and was revived. This is not an improbable event, as Josephus, in *vita* 75, relates that he once met several prisoners who had been crucified and as he perceived three acquaintances among them, he begged of Titus to give them to him. They were accordingly immediately removed and carefully attended to and one was actually saved but the other two could not be revived. On this matter I refer the reader to the wonderful story of Sadhu Haridas, who was at his request buried alive by Ranjit Singh, the Lion of the Panjab, was taken out of the walled up and floored sepulchre after forty days and was revived and all this took place in the presence of Ranjit Singh. This story is graphically described by an Englishman, resident in his court, and the reader will find it in *page 121* of my book on *Christianity*.

24. Mahomed was often asked to show a sign that he was a prophet. He declined to show any miracle saying that the showing of miracles is useless, as formerly apostles came with miracles, still they were put to death *Ch. 3 vs. 179-80, Ch. 17 v. 61*. This goes to the credit of Mahomed. Christ in one place refused to show any miracle, *12 Mat. 38-40, 16 Mat. 4, 11 L. 29*, but at the same time he restored a withered hand *12 Mat. 9-13*, and Christ's divinity depends upon his working miracles, but Mahomed never claimed divinity. He called himself an illiterate prophet, a mere man. *Ch. 7 v. 158*. The greatest miracle of Jesus was his Resurrection but Mahomed denies it. He says that Jesus was never crucified, but a substitute of his was. *Ch. 4 v. 156*. So the question of the Resurrection of Jesus does not arise according to Mahomed. But though Mahomed

refused to work any miracle his followers have attributed several miracles to him. They affirm that trees went forth to meet him that he was saluted by stones; that water gushed from his fingers; that he fed the hungry, cured the sick, and raised the dead; that a beam groaned to him; that a camel complained to him; that a shoulder of mutton informed him of its being poisoned; and that both animate and inanimate nature were equally subject to the apostle of God. His dream of a nocturnal journey is seriously described as a real event. A mysterious animal, the Borak, conveyed him from the temple of Mecca to that of Jerusalem: with his companion Gabriel, he successively ascended the seven heavens, and received and repaid the salutations of the patriarchs, the prophets, and the angels, in their respective mansions. Beyond the seventh heaven, Mahomed alone was permitted to proceed; he passed the veil of unity, approached within two bow-shots of the throne, and felt a cold that pierced him to the heart, when his shoulder was touched by the hand of God. After this familiar though important conversation, he again descended to Jerusalem, remounted the Borak returned to Mecca, and performed in the tenth part of a night the journey of many thousand years. According to another legend, the apostle confounded in a national assembly the malicious challenge of the Koreish. His resistless word split asunder the orb of the moon: the obedient planet stooped from her station in the sky, accomplished the seven revolutions round the Caaba, saluted Mahomed in the Arabian tongue, and suddenly contracting her dimensions, entered at the collar, and issued forth through the sleeve of his shirt. *Gibbon Ch. 50, Vol. 9, pp. 267. 9.* Jesus at first declined

to show a sign, *12 Mat. 38-40; 16 Mat. 4, 11 L. 29*, but afterwards relented and performed thirty five miracles, including the raising of Lazarus, who was buried in the grave four days. After his death Jesus rose from the grave, and some years after he met Saul, now called Paul, at Damascus and converted him to his faith. Christian saints are said to have performed many miracles; and to crown all, their relics, even their bones, got credit for performing miracles. Fortunately we do not hear of miracles now. (I have dealt with Christ's miracles in *Chapter 5 pp. 89-103* of my book on *Christianity*.)

25. The Koran says that the earth, sun, moon and stars and all living creatures were created in 6 days, *Ch. 50 v. 37, Ch. 25 v. 60, Ch. 41 vs. 8-11, Ch. 11 v. 9*, and that Adam was the first man created. A day was one thousand years long, *Ch. 22 v. 46*. All this was taken from the Old Testament from which the Koran has taken many stories. Now, modern science has disproved the story of the Bible regarding creation in six days and that Adam was our first progenitor. The sun, moon, stars and the earth were gradually evolved from nebulous matter. The earth, moon and other planets were at one time incandescent. They have taken millions of years to cool and become solid bodies as they now are. So the earth, as it is, was not created in six days. If Adam had been created when the earth got its separate existence, Adam and all other living beings would have been reduced to gas by the intense heat of the earth as it was in the beginning at least 10,000° hot, a remnant of which heat still exists in the interior of the earth which throws out hot lava from volcanoes. The fact is that Mahomed was born long before

Laplace wrote his treatise on the Celestial Heavens. I do not attach any blame to Mahomed. He got his theory of creation from the Bible written by the illiterate Moses who, like the other ancients, had no knowledge of the law of vortex motion and other laws of motion and who had no idea of the existence of the nebulous matter discernible by the subsequently discovered telescope. Many ancient writers have attempted to describe the method of creation. They have assumed that the universe came into existence by the fiat of the Supreme Being. Most of the Upanishads, all the Puranas and other religious books of the Hindus describe how the universe came into existence. According to them it took a long time to create everything that exists. Their account of creation is more philosophic, and, if I may say so, more consonant to reason than the story of Moses. I do not wish to go fully into the authenticity of the books of Moses. Most modern scholars including many devout Christians now admit that the books of Moses were not in existence in Solomon's time and those books were written by at least four persons who are called for brevity's sake J. E. P. and D which letters stand for the words Jehovist, Elohist, Priest and Deuteronomist. So the so-called books of Moses were not written by Moses. One of them at least, if not all, was accidentally discovered by Hilkiah, the High Priest of Solomon's temple while the temple was being repaired. This discovery was made according to the Bible itself in the 18th year of the reign of king Josiah which corresponds to 621 B. C. 22 (2 K) 8 and 34 (2 Ch) 14. Thus the legend of the authorship of Moses who is said to have brought the Israelites out of Egypt in the 13th or 14th century

B. C. has not any basis of truth and Mahomed is not to be blamed for assuming the correctness of the Bible story. I do not blame Mahomed for that, as before the nineteenth century there was practically no dispute about the genuineness of the Pentateuch, and every devout Christian took every statement in those books as gospel truth. Mahomed's only fault was to write about matters which are beyond the capacity of any human being to know or to understand. I do not wish to tax the reader's patience by going fully into the question of the genuineness of the Pentateuch. Suffice it to say that Bishop Gore's commentary on the Scripture published in 1928, a work written by divines, supports my theory. *Vide pt. 1 pp. 22-36*, art: Introduction to the criticism of the Pentateuch. See also *Religions Systems of the World pp. 42-43*, art: *Ancient Judaism*, *Bradlaugh's article on Man, Where and How in the Freethinkers' Book*, *Encyclopaedia Britannica 14th Edn. art: Bible*. Now it is universally admitted that the Pentateuch is a forgery.

26. The Pentateuch exists in three languages: (1) Hebrew, (2) Samaritan and (3) Septuagint, the Septuagint being a translation of the original Hebrew made in the time of the second Ptolemy about 300 B. C. These 3 versions have various readings. Now it is not necessary to go into this matter. I only wish to state that the age of each generation of the Patriarchs given in the Bible does not agree in the three versions as it will appear from the sub-joined table :

		<u>Before Generation.</u>		
		Heb.	Sam.	Sep.
Adam (5 Gen. 3, 4, 5)	...	130	130	230

Seth (6, 7, 8)	105	105	205
Enos (9, 10, 11)	90	90	190
Cainan (12, 13, 14)	70	70	170
Mahalaleel (15, 16, 17)	65	65	165
Jared (18, 19, 20)	162	62	162
Enoch (21, 22, 23)	65	65	165
Methuselah (25, 26, 27)	187	67	167
Lamech (28, 30, 31)	182	53	188
Noah (32)	500	500	500
Added century to Deluge (VII.					
II.	100	100	100

Date of Deluge ... 1656 1307 2242

These totals show the exact period of the Noachian Deluge after the creation of Adam and are exactly agreed with by Samuel Sharpe, in his "*Translation of the Hebrew Scriptures*," page 8. The generations after the Deluge are:—

			Before Generation.		
			Heb.	Sam.	Sep.
Shem (11 Gen. 10, 11)	2	2	2
Arphaxad (12, 13)	135	135	35
Cainan (omitted in the orthodox Genesis, but inserted in Luke III 36)	130
Salah (14, 15)	30	130	130
Eber (16, 17)	34	134	134
Peleg (18, 19)	30	130	130
Reu (20, 21)	32	132	132
Serug (22, 23)	30	130	130
Nahor (24, 25)	29	79	179
Terah (26, 32)	70	70	70

From alleged date of Deluge to
birth of Abraham ... 292 .942 .1172

making, from the creation of Adam to the birth of Abraham, 1,948 years according to the authorised orthodox English version which follows the Hebrew, according to the Samaritan 2,249, and according to the Septuagint 3,414. As there are such material discrepancies, which of the figures is correct? And the best thing is to reject all the stories. According to the Hebrew version less than 2000 years elapsed between the creation of Adam and the birth of Abraham who was the 42nd ancestor of Jesus, 1 Mt. 17, which was not a very remote event. So these events are very recent. The Piltdown man, the Neanderthal man and the Pekin man were much older than Adam, which leads us to an absurdity.

27. As regards the theory of the creation of Adam and all animals and plants within a period of consecutive six days it appears from the discoveries of most of the geologists that no land animal existed in the beginning. There were only aquatic animals at first. So land animals were not created in any one of the six days allotted to creation. Many of the existing species of trees and herbs did not exist formerly. The same thing can be said of animals. Geology, a recent science, has proved all these facts. As to the creation of the man Adam it appears from the Bible that this event took place only a few milleniums before the birth of Christ. In fact according to 3 *Luke*, 81 generations elapsed between the creation of Adam and the birth of Christ. Christian chronologists, headed by Ussher, have assigned 4000 years for these 81 generations but it appears from the discoveries of geologists that the palaeolithic man existed at least 300,000 years ago, and that the tertiary man was more or less civilized. He used neolithic

instruments and knew the use of gold. After him succeeded the Bronze age, and then the Iron age. The use of iron was known to the ancient Aryans. The Rig-Veda mentions iron forts. So the use of iron was known to the Aryans long before the time of the Rig-Veda which was composed about 2500 B. C. Therefore the use of iron was known to the Aryans at about the time of the creation of the supposed Adam. Then how is it that the descendants of Adam living in America at the time of its discovery by Columbus were ignorant of its use? This shows that the whole story of the creation of Adam is pure imagination.

28. One other matter strikes me. This universe was created including Adam only the other day—according to the Bible and the Koran. Now light travels at the rate of 186,000 miles per second, and it takes 140,000,000 years for a ray of light to reach the earth from the most distant stars observable by the 100 inch telescope of the Mt. Wilson observatory. So these stars were created at least 140 millions of years ago to make them visible to our eyes. This shews that the universe was created, if at all, millions of millions years ago as our biggest telescopes are incapable of observing the whole of the limitless heavens.

29. Regarding creation the *Chandagya Upanishad* says that at first there was one Supreme Being and one only and nothing else. He conceived the desire to be many. First he created light (as the Bible says), then water, then the earth, 6-2-3 and 4. The *Brihat Aranyaka Upanishad* says that in the beginning Brahma existed alone. He created the superior gods. Then he created other beings and he created also Justice, as there is nothing higher than

Justice,* 1.4.14 In 1.4.17 it is said that Brahma being alone desired a wife. Then he was born i.e. he got children. The *Aiterriya Upanishad* says 1.1. that in the beginning the Supreme Being, being alone, desired to create and then created the world, 1.1. The *Prasna Upanishad*, 1.4, says that Prajāpaty produced matter and spirit, and creatures thus came into existence. The other principal Upanishad are silent as to the mode of creation, or as to the time occupied by it. The fact is that the Aryan Rishis rarely went beyond their depth. But their successors, the writers of the Pūranas describe creation more fully but do not limit the period occupied by it. They also did not go much beyond their depth.

30. All the Puranas, theotretically 18 in number but really 19 give some description of the creation of the world, how God created Brahma who floated on the endless waters and afterwards everything began to be evolved out of his egg. But all the Aryan writers assign a long time to creation and describe the gradual evolution of the world. They never assign any period to it, much less six days. It may be argued that six days might mean six long cycles. But each day is described in the Bible as beginning in the evening and ending the next evening, the exact words being "and the evening and morning were the first day" and so on of each day. 1 Gen. vs. 5, 8, 13, 19, 23, 31. This shows that neither the Koran nor the Bible was the work of God who could not have shown such gross ignorance of astronomy and geology and who, ex hypothesi, knew how he created the worlds and what time He took to finish his work.

31. In the Koranic account of the creation of

man, *Ch. 10. 27-35* it is stated that Adam at God's bidding gave names to all things, *R. Isid. f. 341* says that this is taken from the *Mishnah Rabbah* and 2 *Gen. 20*. *In passant*, I may say that the words of the Koran that God "taught Adam the names of all things" are not strictly correct, because there are many things on earth which still have no names.

32. The Koran says that after six days' creation God did not take rest as he was not fatigued, *Ch. 50 v. 14, 37*. What can be the meaning of God's taking rest according to the Bible? Did God feel very tired by his immense six days' work? As there is no further work to do, God having created everything that exists, what is God now doing? Is he idling away his time, and waiting for the Day of Judgment, after which He will have no more work to do? What will God do then? Neither the Old nor the New Testament nor the Koran even gives any hint as to the future work of God after the Last Day. Will God then enjoy a holiday, which every man likes? The Hindu Scriptures show greater intelligence in this matter. According to them there will be cycles of universal destruction and subsequent re-creations of the universe which will keep God always busy. Mahomed also practically says the same thing. He says that God never sleeps nor slumbers, *Ch. 2 v. 256*.

33. Al Gazaly says that God and the Koran are eternal. The Mutazelites are of a different opinion. They cannot conceive how two eternal things can co-exist. The simple answer to it is that Christians believe that three Beings have been co-existing from eternity, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. However we need not discuss this question. But one

thing strikes me. *Ch. 85 vs. 21-22* say "It is a glorious Koran, written on the preserved Table". So none but God could write it, as the world had not been created then and the Koran is explicit upon this point *Ch. 78 vs. 28-29*. "And they gave the lie to our signs, charging them with falsehood. But we noted and wrote down all." See also *Ch. 3 v. 177*. Now if God be the writer of the Koran, it is very strange that He should tell Mahomed that if people say "He hath devised it himself, say then bring a sura like it and call on whom ye can beside God, if ye speaketh truth." *Ch. 10 v. 39*. Why should God offer a challenge to produce a similar chapter? This is derogatory to the dignity of God. Of asimilar import are *Ch. 11 v. 16*, almost exactly in the same words, and *Ch. 52 vs. 34-35*, *Ch. 2 v. 21*. It is incomprehensible why God should descend on the arena and challenge all competitors to produce a similar sura. This challenge of God was accepted by Nadir who produced a poem regarding the Persian kings and published it. Mahomed produced a verse (*Ch. 31 v. 5*) condemning this poem, and predicting a shameful punishment for him, and when Nadir was taken prisoner at the battle of Beder, Mahomed refused to ransom him and he was put to death. This stopped all competition, as the punishment for this boldness was death.

34. Mahomed nowhere says that the Koran is co-eternal with God, but this was the doctrine of Al Gazaly. Mahomed simply says that the Koran was "written on the preserved table," *Ch. 85 v. 22*. If it was written by any one it must have been by God as He was the only Being then in existence. How Al Gazaly said that the written Koran which is lying

on the preserved table has been existing from eternity is a thing which passes one's comprehension. Then who wrote it and who made the table and who kept it there? So Al Gazaly's theory must be wrong and the Mutazilas are right. The Book of man's fate is expressly declared in the Koran to be in the handwriting of God, *Ch. 78 v. 29*, "we noted and wrote down all." So if the Book of Fate and of God's decrees could be written by God what is there to prevent His writing the Koran? Further there was none else to write the Koran but God. So much for the theory that God wrote the Koran and kept it on the preserved table. Now comes the question as to when he wrote it. Did he write it before creation or long after it. We find in it many things taken from the Bible and from a Persian source and the Talmud. It might be said that these things existed in the original Koran, and they being all facts pre-ordained from eternity, any agreement between the Koran and other writings may not matter, though this argument will be deemed highly strained. But what reply can be given to the fact that the Koran expressly mentions the Psalm and quotes from it? In *Ch. 21 v. 105* we find these words: "And now, since the Law was given, have we written in the Psalms that my servants the righteous shall inherit the earth." This quotation is from *v. 29 of Psalm 37*, a Psalm of David. God here expressly refers to this Psalm of David. How can we believe that God anticipated these very words of David, instead of believing that Mahomed, and not God, quoted from the Psalm? Excepting Mahomed's assertion that God wrote the Koran, an assertion not proved by any fact, why should God quote from a book instead of writing from

his omniscient knowledge? This fact and the previously mentioned facts about the adaptation of Jewish and Persian stories clearly prove that the Koran was not written by God. If this argument does not hold good, then any man may quote passages from any book he pleases and refer to the book he quotes from and say that his book has been existing from eternity and God's omniscient knowledge and the theory of predestination will save him from the charge of plagiarism. Further it is said that the Book of Fate was written by God before creation in which every man's actions and fate are recorded, *Ch. 87 v. 3, Ch. 64 v. 2* and other verses (vide Index) but we find that many things were written by God in that Book in Mahomed's time. In *Ch. 3 v. 177* God says: "Now hath God heard the saying of those who said: 'Aye, God is poor and we are rich.' We will surely write down their sayings, and their unjust slaughter of the prophets; and we will say, Taste ye the torment of the burning'." Now what does God mean by saying "we will."? This shows that these sayings were not yet recorded by God, but they will be recorded afterwards. So the theory of the Book of God having been written by God before creation in which every saying and every doing of every man have been recorded is disproved by this verse. The fact is that Mahomed is not consistent in these and other matters. Mahomed assumed that the Koran and the Book of Fate were written by God and to support that theory his followers have invented some theory or other to justify their belief. But we are under no such necessity. We must apply the same canon of proof to the Koran as we apply to other books and then decide whether the major premiss is

correct instead of assuming its correctness to start with and then seek arguments to support it? In judging a matter we should be absolutely just and be free from any kind of bias.

35. Mahomed says that the Koran has been written by God but it has taken many ideas from the Jews and Persians. The word paradise is of Persian origin and the severity of the punishment in hell is of Talmudic origin but the Houris of paradise are of Persian origin. Dr. Sell says that Mahomed's night journey to heaven described in *Ch. 17* and the light of Mahomed and the sharp bridge over hell are of Persian origin. This night journey is based on the ascension of Artavirah, recorded in the book of Aratavirah written about 400 years before Mahomed. He says that the light of Mahomed seems to have been copied from the Pahlavi Minukhirad and the Khashita where a similar account is given of the light of Jamshed which passed on from generation to generation just as the light of the Moslem legend does. As to the bridge over hell *Ch. 36 v. 60*, *Ch. 37 v. 23* the word 'Sirat' is used for the road to hell. Sirat is not called a bridge in the Koran but Al Gazali says it is a bridge stretched over the back of hell, sharper than a sword, finer than a hair. The word 'Sirat' is derived from the old Persian word Chinvat. The whole idea is taken from the Persians and the Jews. It is referred to in the Midrash and in the Dinkart where the speaker says that he worships the Lord in order that he may avoid the punishment of hell and may cross over Chinvat and may attain to the blessed abode.

36. Numerous other examples have been shown by Dr. Sell of the same adaptation of popular legends

and 'apocryphal gospels, such as among others *the legend of the Cave. Ch. 18 vs. 18-25* and the *Miracle of the Table, Ch. 5 vs. 112-115. Rodwell p. 11* says that the Old Testament was translated into Arabic for the first time by R. Saadis Gaon in A. D. 900, and the New Testament in 1171 by a Coptic bishop. So Mahomed had to rely on tradition and apocryphal gospels and other stories. If Dr. Sell's observations be correct then they prove that the Koran was not written by God, but was the work of Mahomed.

37. If the Koran existed before the creation of the worlds and it was written by God, the then sole existing Being, *Ch. 78 v. 29*, in the perspicuous Arabic tongue, then this language must have been the oldest language, existing before man was created. Why God selected such a language which like other Shemetic languages has no vowels, and vowel points were invented about 400 A. D., and Arabic characters were invented by Ibn Morra after the birth of Mahomed? The Shemetics not having vowels used only consonants and they wrote JHV for Jehovah in the Hebrew tongue. In every respect the best language on earth up to date is Sanskrit. Why did not God write in this language? Next comes Greek which was the *lingua franca* of all countries bordering on Arabia, and it would have been much better for the general understanding of the Koran if it had been, like the New Testament, written in the Greek language. The Arabic Koran had to be translated for other peoples and it was first translated into Latin in the ninth century and printed in the seventeenth century.

38. There are many verses in the Koran which

Messiah, Son of Mary; for the Messiah said, "O children of Israel, worship God, my Lord and your Lord. Whoever shall join other Gods with God, God shall forbid him the Garden, and his abode shall be the Fire; and the wicked shall have no helpers. They surely are Infidels who say God is the third of three: for there is no God but one God: and if they refrain not from what they say, a grievous chastisement shall light on such of them as are infidels" *Ch. 5 vs. 76, 77*. It appears that he was at one time pleased with them and at another time got offended with them. The Christian missionaries say that Mahomed at first tried to bring these people into his fold by sweet words, but when they proved obdurate, he abused them and ordered his followers to forsake them. Similarly in one verse Mahomed says "let there be no compulsion in religion" *Ch. 2 v. 257*, and in another place he advises his followers to fight against infidels until there be left the religion of one God" *Ch. 2 v. 189*. These inconsistencies in the Koran are perhaps due to the changing moods of Mahomed.

40. If God be the author of the Koran, why did He send it down piecemeal to Mahomed through Gabriel as occasion arose, and, as we have seen, the verses suited his purpose? Why did God cancel 225 verses for giving better verses? Could He not have foreseen the necessity of the abrogation and why did He then write down the abrogated verses? Why are there mistakes, such as the numbers of prophets being six in chapter seven and seven in chapter eleven? Why is there no methodical arrangement in the Koran, though in point of style, diction and rhetoric it is the best book in the Arabic language. Why are there no many palpable

the last question, about the nature of the soul. So he admitted the existence of the soul our knowledge of which was limited to the senses. He nowhere says that soul, which exists in man, but of which we have a limited knowledge, does not exist in woman. He further says that believers will go to heaven with their souls inside their resurrected bodies. Then what prevents their wives going there with their souls inside their resurrected bodies? There is thus no foundation for the joke of Christian missionaries and Mahomed is perfectly right in saying that God alone knows all about the soul, but men know very little. In *Ch. 40. v. 8. Ch. 4 v. 123, Ch. 13 v. 23*, we find that fathers, wives and children of the righteous ones will go to heaven. See also *Ch. 16 v. 99*. If the males take their souls with them, will the wives leave them behind for Christian missionaries to baptise? Further, this taunt is most undeserved. Mahomed even speaks of animals being resurrected on the Last Day which means that their souls and bodies will reunite, *Ch. 6 v. 38*. But Christ is almost totally silent as to animals. He only mentions the value of sparrows *10 Mat. 29, 12 L. 6*, and speaks of God feeding the fowls of the air, *6 Mat. 26*. So the Mahomedans can turn the tables on these missionaries.

42. Mahomed was incensed against the Meccans and other idolaters. He preached war and vengeance against them and destroyed their idols and told his followers not to make friends with them and the phrase 'love of man' is not to be found in the Koran. But still there are very noble sayings in the Koran. I cite some verses in support of my statement: *Ch. 49*

v. 12, (avoid suspicion, do not traduce another in his absence), *Ch. 3 v. 128*, (master anger, forgive others), *Ch. 5 v. 35* (slayer of one man is slayer of mankind), *Ch. 92 v. 18-21*, (who giveth away his substance that he may become pure and who offereth not favours to any one for the sake of recompense but only as seeking the face of his Lord the Most High and surely in the end he shall be well content) *Ch. 23 v. 98*, (Turn aside evil with that which is better), *Ch. 2 v. 257* (Let there be no compulsion in religion), *Ch. 50 v. 44*. (Thou art not to compel them) *Ch. 6 v. 108*, (Reville not those whom they call on beside God lest they in their ignorance spitefully revile Him, 22 *Ex. 28*), *Ch. 7 v. 150*, (Oh Lord forgive me and my brother and bring us into thy mercy), *Ch. 3 v. 129*, (implore forgiveness of your sins), *Ch. 41 vs. 34-36*, (moreover, good and evil are not to be treated as the same thing. Turn away evil by what is better, and lo ! he between whom and thyself was enmity, shall be as though he were a warm friend. But none attain to this save men steadfast in patience and none attain to it except the most highly favoured. And if an enticement from Satan entice thee, then take refuge in God, for He is the Hearing, the Knowing), *Ch. 3 v. 191*, (O our Lord ! forgive us then our sin, and hide away from us our evil deeds, and cause us to die with the righteous), *Ch. 6 v. 153*, (Do not rob the substance of the orphans but improve it, when giving judgment observe justice though a kinsman's affair), *Ch. 42 v. 37* (Forgiveness recommended), *Ch. 10 v. 27*, (Goodness and good acts recommended). All these verses the reader will find collected in the Index to the Koran at the end of this book under the heading "Precepts".

43. It will be said by the Christian that the Sermon on the Mount is better than these verses put together. But I do not agree with him. Jesus has no doubt uttered many noble sayings in that Sermon. But it is a forgery as I have shown in *p. 220.* of my book on *Christianity*. Chapters three and four of *Matthew* up to verse 24 correspond to *I Mark verses 2 to 28*, then comes the Sermon in *Matthew Chs. 5 to 7*, then *8 Matthew vs. 14-16* again correspond to *I Mark 29 to 34*. Only *4 Mat. 25* and *8 Mat. 1 to 13* are added to Mark's narrative which is very brief. The curious reader will find the table of corresponding verses in the two gospels in the *Synoptic Gospels* by *J. M. Tompson pp. 8-10*. Then I find in *Gore's New Commentary on the Scripture pt. 3 pp. 136 to 145* that most of the sayings in that Sermon were taken from the Old Testament. For instance all the eight Beatitudes in *5 Mat. 3 to 12* commencing with "the blessed are the poor in spirit" are taken from Deuteronomy, Isaiah and the Psalms. As to the Lord's Prayer in *6 Mat. 9-13*, I have discussed this matter in a previous page and shown that the Fatihat (*Ch. 1*) of Mahomed is better than the Lord's Prayer. I have discussed this matter about the Sermon on the Mount in *pp. 32 to 44* of my book on *Christianity* to which I refer the reader. No doubt there are many noble sayings in the gospels, but who knows which of them are genuine and which apocryphal, and Paul's Sermon in *Chs. 12 to 15* of his *Epistle to the Romans* is equally good. But there is no precept in the gospels equal to Mahomed's saying in *Ch. 2 v. 257* "Let there be no compulsion in religion." Though the Koran abrogated this verse, still it is one of the wisest sayings in history. This reminds me of what Con-

Correct said in his *Sketch of the Progress of Human Intellect*: "L'autorite legitime de la loi ne s'etend pas au dela qui blesse le droit d'autrui." Law should not interfere unless a man's right is invaded. But the history of the world has been otherwise. What miseries men have suffered for differences of religion and still suffer? Another noble saying of Mahomed was "turn away evil with what is better" *Ch. 41 v. 32-35*. His greatest saying was there is no God but God while Christ said "My Father and I are one" *10 J. 38*. Where does Jesus say "do not drink wine or do not bet", two of the worst vices in Christian Europe, and the cause of destitution and endless misery to families?

14. One singular fact strikes me both in the Gospels and the Koran. Christ never speaks of his mother, except tauntingly when he practically disowned her, and did not call her to his presence where she could not come on account of the crowd, *12 Mat. 20-50*, *3 Mk. 31-35*, and all Catholics worship her as divine. He also never mentions his father. As to Mahomed he also is silent as to his parents. As Mahomed was very young when they died he know very little of them. But Charist's father was with him at the temple when he was twelve years old (*2 L. 41-42*) and we do not know when he died. But as to his mother she was present at the first prayer meeting after his death (*1 A. 14*). So there can be no justification for Jesus omitting all reference to his mother except as stated above. Mahomed supplies this omission. He refers to Virgin Mary in *Ch. 3 v. 31*, *Ch. 4 v. 169*, *Ch. 5 v. 79*, *Ch. 19 v. 16*, *Ch. 21 v. 91*, *Ch. 66 v. 12*, and speaks sometimes highly of her, as in the last verse. He used to say that

there were many perfect men but only four perfect women, Asia, the wife of the Pharaoh, Virgin Mary, Khadija, his first wife and Fatima his surviving daughter. But Jesus has never praised any man or woman by name.

45. The Koran was written in Arabic and addressed to the Meccans and Arabs, *Ch. 2 vs. 19, 146* and they were ordered to believe in one God and to fight for His cause, to believe in resurrection and the other tenets of Islam and to follow the several injunctions of that religion. But nowhere is it said that people outside Arabia should follow or be compelled to follow Islam. No doubt Mahomed sent embassies to the kings and emperors of Abyssinia, Persia and of the Greek empire, inviting them to accept his religion but he left no injunction to his followers to spread his religion outside Arabia, and it was a mere accident which enabled the Saracens to spread their dominion and with it their religion, they being impelled more by want and lust of conquest than by a missionary spirit. The Koran says that it is in Arabic so that the people may easily understand it, *Ch. 13 v. 37, Ch. 41 v. 44, Ch. 43 v. 2, Ch. 16 v. 105, Ch. 44 v. 58, Ch. 20 v. 112, Ch. 26 v. 195, Ch. 19 v. 97, Ch. 12 v. 2*. If Mahomed meant his Koran for mankind why did he select a practically unknown language the characters of which were very recently invented by Moramer Ibn Morra, a native of Irak, and not Greek which was the prevalent language in the adjoining countries, and in which the apostles of Jesus, who were with the doubtful exception of Luke, all Jews, thought it proper to write, as their books were intended for people outside Judea? This inclines me to the belief that the

Koran was intended for the Arabs only and they have spread it with their conquests. The Koran enjoins its followers to fight against the infidels which term included Jews and Christians, *Ch. 5 vs. 56, 76-77* with whom he had been previously friendly *Ch. 2 v. 59*. But after the lust for conquest had been satiated the Mahomedans never attacked any nation simply to fight for the cause of Islam. These and other considerations lead one to suppose that Mahomed addressed his Koran only to his countrymen, and he never left behind him any injunction to his followers to spread his religion outside Arabia. This is a novel idea but I think there is some substratum of truth in this.

CHAPTER IV.

OTHER CRITICISMS.

1. Nowhere do we find any mention in the Koran or the Bible of equality between the sexes. Regarding inheritance the woman's share is half of the male's. Women can be divorced at men's sweet will, but they cannot divorce their husbands at will. In heaven men will get houris for their spouses but the Koran is silent as whether women will get in heaven any spouses besides their husbands or lead a lonely life for eternity. The Koran goes to the extreme length of saying that "your wives are your field, go in therefore to your field as ye will", *Ch. 2 v. 223*. The Koran says that men are superior to women and a husband can chide his refractory wife and he is permitted even to scourge her, *Ch. 4 v. 38*. A man may marry four women and possess any number of female slaves as concubines, but a woman has not any such privilege. No doubt man is physically and intellectually abler than woman, but women are far better than men morally and socially. They are angels and we are devils in disguise. They have made this earth appear like heaven and we men have made a hell of it. Man has been fighting like dogs since he came upon the earth. History is composed to a great extent of the activities of these conquerors of mankind who regarded man as food for powder and we are taught to admire them instead of cursing them. But they were all men excepting the mythical Semiramis. They have all led vast armies. And what is the

object of an army ? It is only to kill and take prisoners. How many women have ordered the wholesale massacre of prisoners of war ? Tamerlane massacred 70,000 prisoners at Ispahan, and 90,000 at Bagdad and ordered the killing of 100,000 men at Delhi. Regarding great generals we find that Napoleon caused the deaths of millions of man. The last Emperor of Germany was the cause of innumerable deaths and unspeakable sufferings of men. They were not women, but men and we highly esteem the abilities of the great conquerors of the world, the enemies of mankind, forgetting that they thought of their men as mere food for powder, forgetting that men being visible and tangible gods should never be put to death, except in very extreme cases. If women had not exerted their beneficent influence upon men, the world would have been much less happy than it is. Plato, the spokesman of the female sex, thought that women will make inferior soldiers and public officers, and there can be no difference of opinion upon that point, but in matters of social service they are immeasurably superior to men. Further almost all strifes and cruelties practised upon men have been the work of the sterner sex. Religious wars and persecutions including the suppression of the several heresies in Christian Europe, the horrors of the Inquisition, the barbarities of the Negro slavery and similar outrages upon mankind were all the work of men and not of women. But so long men have been so barbarous and selfish that up to the last Great War they excluded females from all public offices. Up to date we have not yet heard of any female superior judge or magistrate, any female high church dignitary or the female governor

of any province and still we call ourselves civilized. When all distinctions of race, colour, creed or sex will vanish, then, and not till then, will man be justified in calling himself civilized. Europeans and Americans think that because they have much advanced in the production of material comforts, and because they travel rapidly on land, water or air and can earn large sums of money, they are the chosen people of this earth. But I ask how many people among them are content with their lot, and if the principal object of life is mental happiness, I repeat how many are content with their lot, and where there is no contentment, there can be no happiness, as man is always running to catch the receding golden cup which always eludes his grasp. Our sole object of existence on earth is to make ourselves happy and to try to spread happiness to all men and women, as far as it lies within our limited power and not to dominate over any people or section of any people, male or female. Lastly let me say that outside one's home it is all strife and snatching away another's food from his mouth, and the moment one leaves the public behind him and enters his house and is surrounded by the females he enjoys real happiness, free from all strifes and jealousies, and this is due to the presence of the divinity we call Woman.

2. In connection with the equality of the sexes, I find that the Koran says that women should always be veiled when they appear before men, *Ch. 33 vs. 33, 53, 59*. This is what Hindu women also do. Mahomedan women, like the Jewish women, are not permitted to pray in a mosque with men and the *purdā* system has gone so far that no respectable woman can show her face to any one who is not

within the prohibited degrees of affinity and consanguinity or go out in public, *Ch. 33 v. 33*. In Turkey, I understand, the *purda* has been partly abolished and the Egyptians are trying to follow the example of the Turks, but recently King Amanulla of Afganistan had to fly and leave his throne because he had among other things abolished the *purda*. Mahomedan women see their Hindu sisters practically abolishing the *purda* and they are now anxious to follow their example, but it seems the Mahomedans are more conservative than the Hindus. Many Hindu women have gone to Europe with their husbands but I have never heard of any such thing in Mahomedan society. Then there is the saying of Mahomed that man is superior to woman, *Ch. 4 v. 38*, which agrees with the view of Plato "men are superior to women in everything", *Grote's Plato Vol. 3 p. 68*. For the edification of my Mahomedan brothers I give some quotations from Plato's Republic which show how advanced were his views, though he wrote 2, 300 years ago. *Grote's Plato Vol. 3 p. 67*: "The Guardians will consist both of man and woman. The woman will receive the same training both musical and gymnastical as the man." *p. 68*: "Between women generally and men generally, in reference to the discharge of duties, there is no other difference, except that men are superior to women in everything; the best women will be on a level only with the second best men, but they will be superior to all men lower than the second best those who are best qualified by nature for the office of Guardians, must be allotted to that office: they must discharge it along with the men and must be trained for it by the same education as the men,

musical and gymnastical". *p.* 72 : "As in other races of animals, males and females must go out to fight and each will inspire the other with bravery". *p.* 104 : "What has been said about the male Guardians and philosophers must be understood to apply equally to the female. We recognise no difference in this respect between the two sexes". We ought to be ashamed of our conservative opinions about women when we find such ideas were written so many centuries ago, and we practically did nothing in the direction indicated by Plato before a decade ago. Such is the selfish nature of man, who has never in any country yet carried out Plato's ideas and there is difference between man and woman in almost all matters, social, legal, and political.

3. The idea of mankind till almost the end of the World War was to keep down womankind. None but Plato advocated their cause before Mill, or rather his wife, wrote his treatise on the Subjection of Women. The Greeks did not even allow their women to dine with them in public and they were the most highly cultured people in antiquity. Women entered the Court in the company of men for the first time in the Field of the Cloth of Gold in the sixteenth century, and in England they got their franchise in this century. The Revolutionists of France introduced universal suffrage but women were excluded. As to India, everybody knows that the great legislator Manu has said that women should be always under tutelage, first under their fathers, then under their husbands and lastly under their sons. This has been the idea of all Hindus though they have got a memorable saying that the mother and one's birth place are superior even to heaven. Even

the writers on the latest phase of Hinduism, the Tantras, are of the same opinion vide *Mahāvīra Tantra* (*M. N. Dutt's translation*) pp. 136, 137 and this book is supposed to have been written in the eighteenth century. It says in *Ch. 8 vs. 100101*: "As regards women, they are not required to go to the holy places or to observe fasts and other such acts, or perform any vows, except obeying and reverencing their husbands. The husbands of women are their Tirthas, (pilgrimage) their Tapas, (devotion); their acts of charity, their religious vows and their spiritual guide; therefore with all their hearts women should obey and serve their husbands." In *Ch. 8 v. 106* it says: "In her childhood a woman should remain under the care of her parents, on her attaining youth and maturity, under the care of her husband, and on the advent of old age, under the care of her husband's relatives and friends; but she should never be independent."

4. Such is the prejudice against, and want of affection for, the female sex that we have no history of the most illustrious women who gave birth to their illustrious sons. Buddha's mother died in giving him birth and we know only her name. Christ's mother survived him and we only know her by her name. The Gospels are silent as to what she said or did after the birth of her godlike son. *Mathew Ch. 1* and *Luke Ch. 1* give us some words uttered by her regarding her immaculate conception, and *John Ch. 2* gives us some words of her when the stock of wine had gone out at a marriage feast at Cana when Jesus turned water into wine. Mahomed's mother died when he was an infant. Regarding Buddha's and Mahomed's mothers it might be said that they were

very young, probably in their teens when they died and so had no opportunity to do or say anything wise or memorable, and their lives were not written by any body as no one could anticipate the greatness of their sons. But as regards Virgin Mary, she must have died at a comparatively advanced age, her son being thirty-three years old when he died in her presence. But strange to say no evangelist has thought it proper to narrate any important event in her life except the immaculate conception nor any saying of her worth recording. This shows the great want of respect for the memory of females, however great and venerable they or their children may be. This was almost the invariable rule in ancient times. We know very little of the life of Olympias, who survived her son Alexander, or the life of the mother of any great man of antiquity, such as Plato or Aristotle or of the host of other great men who have flourished in times gone by. Thousands of great men have flourished and they had as many mothers. The acts and sayings of the sons have been recorded in books, but how many books are there recording the acts and sayings of their mothers? This shows great want of respect for the female sex who are regarded merely as instruments for the propagation of our species. Perhaps this was due to the idea that sons become great through their fathers, and not through their mothers, a view which gets its support from Herbert Spencer's theory of the limitation of heredity by sex. But there are exceptions to this rule, as to every rule. Napoleon's mother and Alexander's mother were extraordinary women, though ill fated.

5. The Christian missionaries have, generally

speaking abused Mahomed. In fact they cannot conceive of any character which is superior to Christ's in any respect. But what reforms did Christ introduce among his countrymen? Slavery was in full force in the time of Jesus and his followers gave it up in the last century after a hard struggle. In this respect Mahomed is in the same predicament as Christ. He legalises slavery and the enjoyment of female slaves. But Mahomed has prohibited wine drinking, wagering, and all games of chance, child murder, and idolatry. I shall return to this subject when I shall compare the two religions and their founders.

6. Prideaux says that the Koran is a bundle of juggleries, chapter after chapter got up to excuse and varnish the author's successive sins. There is some truth in this, and even his defender, Carlyle, admits that Mahomed was not always sincere. He no doubt introduced great reforms among the semi-civilized Arabs, he abolished infant murder, restricted polygamy to a certain extent, introduced some good laws among the Arabs and abolished idolatry for good in his country. But still Dr. Wherry says that Mahomed's character was notoriously inconsistent, and he says "what we deliberately assert, after having studied this subject for well nigh a score of year, is that the prophet of Islam did consciously fabricate speeches and palm them off upon the people as the very words of God" (*Indian Evangelical Review*, April 1887 p. 392.)

7. Carlyle has included Mahomed in his book "*Heroes and Hero Worship*" and has made him the only "Hero as Prophet" and he speaks very highly of him. No doubt Mahomed was a hero and a great

man. He lived very frugally, his usual fare consisting of dates and unleavened bread, though he was master of Arabia. His drink was water, not wine the use of which he forbade in the Koran. He mended his own shoes and patched his cloak. But Carlyle should not have said that Mahomed "was not a sensual man." He left nine widows and had at least two concubines, one of whom Mary Copt figures prominently in the Koran. His followers could have only four wives besides female slaves, *Ch. 4 v. 3*, but Mahomed could marry any number besides possessing slaves, *Ch. 33 v. 49* "a privilege for thee above the rest of the faithful". Judge Syed Amir Ali also justifies his ten marriages after the death of his first wife Khadijah, who was his sole wife as long as she lived. He justifies some marriages on political grounds such as cementing union with powerful people, others on the ground of the poverty of the brides. Many marriages are contracted for acquisition of wealth or for forming alliances with rich and powerful families. If these be grounds of justification for the plurality of wives then monogamy ought to be abolished. But no civilised man will admit the validity of this sort of reasoning. Carlyle says Mahomed was not a sensual man because he was not a common voluptuary as he mended his own shoes and lived frugally. This is fallacious. Licentiousness is one thing and frugality is another thing. Many misers are licentious. Carlyle says that Mahomed ordered his followers to give ten per cent of their income in alms. Sale says it is one fortieth of the income *Præl. Dis. p. 85*. Carlyle has exaggerated the figure. He says that in the Koran there is really very little

said about the joys of Paradise "they are intimated rather than insisted on. Nor is it forgotten that the highest joys even there shall be spiritual, the pure Presence of the Highest, this shall infinitely transcend all other joys". This is not correct. The joys of heaven are oftener mentioned than any other thing in the Koran, vide *Ch. 55* and other suras. There might be something in the last observation of Carlyle about God's pure presence but Mahomed does not expressly say so. As to the propagation of the religion of Islam by the sword he says that Charlemagne also forced the Saxons to be Christians. But two wrongs do not make a right. He rightly says that the book is very toilsome reading and is full of "endless iterations, longwindedness, entanglement ; most crude, incondite;—insupportable stupidity, in short". In one matter I fully agree with him. It is that Moslems have more faith in their religion than Christians in theirs.

8. The other panegyrist of Mahomed is Judge Syed Amir Ali, a lawyer, who says everything that is possible to be said for his client omitting many unfavourable facts, and abuses the attorney of the other side. He justifies, as already stated, the polygamy of Mahomed and he could also say that rich Mahomedans have harems. The last King of Oudh who was a state prisoner in Calcutta in our time left 265 concubines. The last but one Shah of Persia had 1750 concubines, which he, after his European tour in this century, reduced to 50. He justifies polygamy among Mahomedans on the ground that the ancients, including Athenians, Hindus and Jews, had it, and Hindus have it still. But this is no justification. Hindus had human sacrifice and Jews had it till forbidden

by 18 *Lev* 21 The Athenians immolated a pair of human victims every year, and Caesar says the Britons burnt alive many human beings at a time and the Germans also sacrificed hundreds at a time. If Mahomed followed the ancient custom of polygamy because he found it prevalent, then why did he forbid infanticide which was also an ancient custom in Arabia and Sparta and is still practised in India? Further, he forgets that the Koran was written by God and so no man can alter it. So this polygamy is stereotyped among Moslems. God should have foreseen these things. Amir Ali has seen only one side of the shield. He quotes *Ch. 2 v. 257* "Let there be no compulsion in religion", and highly extols Mahomed for this. But he singularly omits all the verses which enjoin the killing of infidels and to go on killing them till the religion of one God be established *Ch. 2. 189*. Nor does he quote *Ch. 4 v. 91* which says that if a Moslem becomes an apostate, he should be put to death, so that there is a reward for conversion to Mahomedanism but death for conversion from Mahomedanism. He quotes *Ch. 2 v. 286*, but not *v. 189*. and he quotes *Ch. 4 v. 87*, but not *v. 91*. What candid opinion can be expected from such a one sided critic? Amir Ali's onesidedness reminds one of Nelson putting the telescope to his blind eye. A critic should be fair and candid and not a panegyrist and advocate. His argument that other people are wanting in toleration, therefore we cannot blame Mahomed for his want of it, is baseless. And his argument in support of Mahomed's views about slavery is wrong. Because the ancients did a wrong thing can a reformer support it on the ground of long usage? This does not speak highly of the sense of

propriety of the reformer particularly when he says he has received a mandate from God on that subject.

9. In their zeal for Mahomed these two critics pass over his many faults. However there can be no doubt that Mahomed is worthy of all praise. But for his illiteracy he would have been ranked as one of the greatest Heroes. I am myself tempted to believe that he was the greatest genius the world has ever produced. His friends and companions had higher respect for his person than those of Buddha or Christ, the other two great religious reformers of the world. The countrymen of Jesus were not his followers and his nation still disowns him. Buddha and Mahomed were not disowned by their countrymen, and they had many followers in their life time. But for Paul I doubt if Christ's religion would have survived him. Certainly it would not have been preached to the Gentiles who were and are its only followers. Buddhism spread over India in Buddha's life time and at one time there were more Buddhists in India than Hindus, and to-day there are millions of Buddhists in Eastern Asia. There is no doubt that there are to-day practically no Buddhists in India. The fact is, Brahminism, the prevailing religion of India, has absorbed it. Mahomedanism rapidly spread through Arabia, so much so that with the exception of the followers of Mosleima, who lived in a small part of Arabia, the rest of the Arabs became Mahomed's followers in his life time. There is one very important matter which should not be omitted. Buddha did not claim to be God, in fact he never admitted the existence of God, but his followers have raised him to the position of God. This is not strange. Deification is the natural bent of mankind. Roman emperors, good or bad, were deified, and in this tieth century,

ordinary religious teachers are being deified in Bengal. Christ in one place (*10 J, 30*) says "I and my Father are one." But Renan says in his *Life of Christ* (*pp. 11-13*) that the book of John is apocryphal. Still all devout Christians believed and still believe that it is a genuine book. There are other passages in the Bible, particularly in the Epistles, which have made people believe that Jesus is God. The result is that all Christians without exception give Jesus a place in the godhead, and Jesus is practically the principal God, as he is concerned with our salvation. But Mahomed, by calling himself a mere man, (*Ch. 17 v. 95, Ch. 18 v. 110*) has stopped the way of his deification. In this respect he is far superior to Christ and Buddha.

CHAPTER V.

CHRISTIANITY AND MAHOMEDANISM COMPARED.

1. In a previous page of this book I promised to compare the religion of Christ with that of Mahomed. Mahomed was illiterate as he himself admits, *Ch. 7 vs. 156, 158*. Jesus no doubt read the scripture at Synagogues but his learning was doubted. "The Jews marvelled, saying how knoweth this man letters, having never learned" *J. 15*. However Jesus' learning did not go beyond reading the Scripture. Jesus was the son of a carpenter and he followed his father's trade, while Mahomed belonged to the most illustrious family in Mecca. Jesus lived upon a simple fare and complained that he had not a place to lay his head on, though even foxes had their holes, *8 Mat. 20, 9 L. 58*. Mahomed lived frugally, living mostly on dates, unleavened bread and water, not wine, which seems to have been the beverage of Jesus on solemn occasions at least, his first miracle being the production of wine at a marriage feast in Cana, *2 J. 1-11* and his last drink was also wine at his Last Supper which he blessed and gave to his apostles to drink, saying it was his blood, and the bread he gave them to eat was his flesh. This Eucharist was the cause of endless quarrels between the Roman Catholics and the Protestants. I am led to suspect that the early Christians actually took human flesh and blood for this Eucharist. At least the early Christians were charged with infant murder for this purpose. The several sects of Christians charged one another with this offence. When

Tertullian, a Father of the Church, joined the Montanists, another sect of Christians, he divulged everything. See his *Treatise on Fasting* Ch. 17. See also E. P. Meredith's *Prophet of Nazareth* pp. 225-7, 231. The Circular Epistle of the Church of Smyrna about the martyrdom of St. Polycarp in 155 states that the Christians present at the martyrdom begged the executioner to give them the half burnt body to enable them to eat his flesh. See the Epistle, Secs. 15 to 18 in Wake's *Apostolic Fathers*, pp. 199-200. But Mahomed never thought of drinking human or any blood and eating human flesh. Christ never said what his position was as to God, was it the same as that of ordinary mortals or something higher, a demi-god or a part God. Mahomed is explicit on this point. He calls Jesus a man and an apostle. At last Mahomed calls the Trinitarians infidels, as he is dead against a second or third godhead. In fact this doctrine of Trinity is meaningless, and even its founder, Athanasius, could not understand it as stated in a previous page. The idea of Trinity arose from 5 (1 J.) 7 which speaks of the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost, but it has now been found that this verse is spurious and so it has been omitted from the Revised Version. 28 Mat. 19 is also to the same effect but it has been widely rejected. See Gore's *New Commentary on the Scripture* Pt. 3 p. 204. No one has been able to understand this Trinity or the Hindu Trinity. Illingworth has written a book on Trinity, but he has assumed its existence and does not explain its nature, which is beyond the comprehension of man. So Mahomed is for one God and one God only or *ekamevadityam* of the *Chandogya Upanishad*. In one respect Christ and Mahomed agree, and that is the eternal bliss of the believer and

the eternal damnation of the unbeliever. This will exclude the majority of mankind from heaven. Upon this point I shall quote from *Kuran—Fin* p. 233 "Never will I seek, nor receive, private individual salvation—never enter into final peace alone; but for ever, and everywhere, will I live and strive for the universal redemption of every creature throughout the world."

2. Mahomed was dead against drinking of wine as already stated. He also abolished games of chance. In this respect he is superior to Jesus. But as to slavery and polygamy Christ is silent as to these two matters so that he is neither for nor against slavery or polygamy. Jesus never married and so we know nothing regarding his ideas about the number of wives. We only know that he was against divorce for any cause except unchastity. The great fault of Mahomed is his saying that his book was written by God, so that Mahomedan laws and customs cannot be altered, the result being that polygamy and slavery cannot be abolished and even such a petty matter as the reformation of the calendar cannot be effected as God has fixed the number of months at twelve *Ch.* 9 v. 36, and they are all lunar. Mahomed abolished infanticide and the greatest thing he did was to weld the Arabs into one nation, so that within a few years after his death they conquered all the surrounding countries.

3. Jesus is silent as to how man was created, but Mahomed supplies the omission. Mahomed says in one place that man was made of clay *Ch.* 55 v. 13 and other verses, in another place he says man was created of dust which is perhaps the same thing, *Ch.* 3 v. 52, *Ch.* 11 v. 69, and in a third place he says that

man was made of water, *Ch. 24* v. *44*, which is also the same thing, as clay is made of dust and water, and lastly he says that man was made of clots of blood, *Ch. 96* v. *2*. So we have four materials from which man was created. As to the last, where did this clot of blood come from? It must have been then of some animal created before man was created, and they were all created on the sixth day, animals first and man afterwards, *1 Gen. 24-27*. This supports Darwin's theory about the descent of man from the anthropoid ape, enunciated in his *Descent of Man*.

4. I have already stated that Christ is silent as to the hereafter of all animals, birds, beasts and insects, but Mahomed has provided for them at the resurrection, *Ch. 6* v. *38*, and the two Indian religions place them on a par with mankind, and all are amenable to the inexorable law of Karma. It is strange that Christ almost forgot the existence of the animal world. He only mentions the value of sparrows, *10 Mat. 29, 12 L. 6* and speaks of God feeding the fowls of the air (*6 Mt. 26*). Ethics means one's duty to other beings, and I should say that the lower animals have some idea of what their duty is towards their masters or members of the same species or other animals. No ethical or religious science can be complete which omits animals. Do not some animals try their best to protect and nourish their young and and do not they express great sorrow when their young die? They know to a certain extent what their duty is to other beings. In fact they have a moral sense, not fully developed, just like that of an infant. Then what about the vegetable kingdom? Manu says that plants have life. Professor Francis Darwin long ago discovered that "in plants there is a

faint copy of what we know as consciousness in ourselves," and now Professor Sir Jagadish Bose has proved this matter scientifically. Buckle in his *History* says that all matter has life, *Vol. 2 p. 419*. Jesus concerned himself with man only, Mahomed with man and animals, Hindus and Buddhists with man, animals and all living beings, and the next religious teacher will speak of plants also. So all old religions are incomplete and Christ's religion is the most incomplete and Mahomed has spoken of many social customs and reformed some, whereas Christ spoke only of God and of man's salvation, besides giving some moral precepts.

5. I have in a previous page shown that the Christian creed is the Fatherhood of God but not the Brotherhood of Man. Christ merely says "love thy neighbour as thyself" *10 Mat. 19, 22 Mat. 20, 10 L. 27*. This idea is taken from *10 Lxx. 18* which speaks of the Jewish neighbour. I have discussed this matter in a previous page, and so I do not wish to discuss it again. All I wish is that this word brotherhood is not to be found in the four gospels at all. Mahomed hated the infidels so much that he was for extirpating them, *Ck. 2 v. 186* and so could not dream of brotherhood of man.

6. In a very important matter there is great difference between Christ and Mahomed. The former said sell "everything and then come to me, give everything to the poor, the rich cannot enter heaven." These and similar sayings led to monasticism ascetism but Mahomed never uttered such precepts. He said only "give alms." Hindus and Buddhists give alms, but Christians rarely do so. They will give large sums for charity and form charitable or religious institutions, but

they rarely give alms and they never have any *mosafer-khana* or *dharinasala* where a man may lay his head without payment, but Buddhists, Hindus and Mahomedans always give alms to the needy and sometimes feed the wayfarer. As to hospitality, it is a well known fact that the Arabs are the most hospitable people on earth. The fact is that there is something good in every religion and something bad too, and some people are good in spite of their bad religion and some are bad in spite of their good religion. So we should not compare the conduct of two peoples solely by their faith but by what they do. Though Mahomed was against stoicism and his heaven is epicurean, and he did not introduce any system of monasticism, still we now see some fakirs; but they came into existence about three centuries after his death.

7. As to Heaven and Hell I do not find in the Gospels any description of Heaven, but Jesus mentions fire in the place where the damned will go and the punishment will be everlasting. *25 Mat. 41; 46, 9 Mk. 43, 44*. Jesus does not describe either Heaven or Hell, but Mahomed gives a glowing description of Heaven and a tolerably gloomy description of Hell. Mahomed speaks of fire in Hell, that it has a partition wall, that it has seven portals, that there is a sharp-edged bridge over it which the resurrected will pass, the infidels tumbling into it and the blessed easily passing over it. Mahomed says that each time a fresh skin will form, the unbeliever will be thrown back into the fire. As to Heaven, Jesus and Mahomed mention it often. It has a solid vault, and Paul says that he knew a man who was caught up to the third heaven *12 (2 Cor.) 2*, which is paradise, *12 (2 Cor.) 4*.

8. Christians and Mahomedans differ in many respects in their habits. If two Mahomedans sit together to dine and if a good morsel of food falls upon the plate of one of them, then he hands it over to the other and if several people dine together then it is made over to the man on the right hand. Several people drink water out of the same glass without washing or throwing out the contents, but each Christian must have a separate glass for himself; no Christians will ever allow the remnant of water in his glass to be drunk by another. As regards the orthodox Hindu, no one can touch another while he is eating, as he regards eating a *jajna*, a sacrifice, a queer and most unsocial idea. Christians must be baptised by a priest or clergyman, and there must be an imposition of hands, so that the Holy Ghost may come, which means that these are the exclusive privileges of these Christian Brahmins, from whom the Hindu Brahmins differ only in one respect; the Hindu priesthood is hereditary, while the Christian priesthood is not, and the principal reason for that is that the Catholic priests were forbidden to marry and leave offspring, for, if they were allowed to marry and leave progeny, I have no doubt that they would have tried their best to leave their office to their sons. Mahomedans, on the other hand, have no priesthood. They generally say their prayers in a mosque where people congregate at the time of prayer. But no priest leads their service, and a man may pray at any place outside a mosque but it is convenient to go to a mosque where they can have water for their ablutions. They pray individually not in chorus, and are not bound to follow any priest. In fact there is no priesthood among them, though they

have learned divines who know the 'Koran by heart and who are consequently much respected and often consulted. Mahomedans never give any first fruits to any one, but the Catholics do so even to-day, and Hindus do it in a literal sense, as they must not eat any fruit of the season, or drink the first drawn out milk of the cow without offering it to an idol, which eats and drinks only theoretically and leaves everything for his priest, and if there be no idol in the village, then the offering is made to the priest himself as the visible representative of God on earth, as Manu says in *Ch. 1 vs. 93* et seq.

9. I must find fault with both Christians and Mahomedans in one respect. In time of war, they both go to their church or mosque and pray for the victory of their arms. In the South African war, the Queen, the nobles, and the higher clergy headed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the head of the church, went in open procession to St. Paul's Cathedral and knelt to God and prayed for the victory of the British arms. They forgot that the Boers did likewise and in such circumstances what did God do or what should He have done? The same pageant was repeated on the occasion of the Great War by both belligerents including Turkey. But the result shows that God sided with the British on both occasions, and forgot on the last occasion to send a large legion of angels to fight on the side of the Turks. Why should God be invoked in a quarrel between men? The Hindus have a similar custom. The litigants promise a goat or a buffalo to the goddess, and as the case must be decided in favour of one of the parties, the goddess gets the sacrifice all the same, and the successful party attributes his success to the intervention of the

goddess, while the unsuccessful party ascribes his loss to his ill-luck, never to the partiality of the goddess. In the case of Christians, I believe, they ascribe their loss to their own fault like the Hindus and not to God the Father, Christ and the Holy Ghost being concerned only with salvation and right conduct. The Mahomedans ascribe their loss to predestination. But if everything is pre-ordained, then why pray for success ?

10. In one most important respect Mahomed is far superior to Jesus. Mahomed always said that there is only one God. In this he was certainly right, for there can be only two alternative theories in religion, either atheism, leaving everything to the unalterable laws of nature, or theism, the religion of one God. Jesus speaks of the Heavenly Father, but nowhere does he say that God is only one and has no equals. In 10 J. 30 he says "I and my Father are one," which is either blasphemy or pure pantheism. Mahomed is guilty of no such thing. The whole of John's gospel is said to be a forgery according to Renan, vide his *Life of Christ* pp. 11-13, but as long as it is included in the Christian canon, we are bound to attribute this saying to Christ. In fact nowhere does Christ define his position towards God. This is the great fault in the four gospels, which has caused people to attribute godhead to Christ and he is said to be God and our saviour.

11. In another very important matter Mahomed is superior to Jesus. Mahomed says that his past sins were forgiven by God *Ch. 48 v. 2*, but he does not, like Jesus, claim the power to forgive sins, *9 Mat. 6*, nor does he claim like Jesus that he came to save men, *18 Mat. 11, 12 J. 47*, and no successor of

Mahomed, like the Christian Pope, has ever claimed that power. The Pope not only claims that power, but he once issued a commission for the sale of the remission of sins called Indulgences, which led to Luther's reformation in the sixteenth century, and even to-day the Catholic priests give a dying man extreme unction, which is a pardon for all past sins. So Christian priests also have usurped the functions of God, or of Christ the Saviour, but Mahomedans are strongly opposed to such strange ideas, and with them God only can forgive sins.

12. To sum up the difference between the sayings of Christ and of Mahomed, we find in the first place that Mahomed prohibited the drinking of blood and the taking of human flesh, but Christ, on the contrary, on the occasion of his last supper gave a cup of wine to each of his apostles and told them to drink the wine, saying it was his blood, and gave a piece of bread to each, saying it was his flesh, and the early Christians killed infants and took their flesh and blood as I have stated in a previous page. Mahomed forbade the drinking of wine, but Christ miraculously made wine out of water at Cana when his mother told him that wine had run out, which was his first miracle, and as just said he gave wine to his apostles to drink, the result is that Christians are, among civilized peoples, the greatest consumers of wine on earth. Christ is silent as to games of chance, lottery, usury, but Mahomed prohibits all these vices. Christ is silent also as to pilgrimage, though he performed it every year, but Mahomed is express upon this matter and it is the duty of every believer to go on a pilgrimage to Mecca at least once in his life. Mahomed enjoins fasting, but Jesus is silent on this matter.

Mahomed said give one fortieth of your income in alms, but Gibbon and Carlyle say it is one tenth, contrary to Sale's view, who says it is one fortieth. Jesus nowhere orders his followers to pray but taught his disciples only the words of the prayer. But Mahomed orders all believers to pray five times every day. Both extol the efficacy of prayer, Christ says it can remove mountains, Mahomed says it is the Pillar of Religion. Christ is silent as to predestination, an idea first started by Paul, but Mahomed lays stress on it, and speaks of a Book of Fate. Mahomed gives many attributes to God, but Jesus is almost silent on this matter. In most places he speaks of God as Heavenly Father, but does not call himself Heavenly Son, or speak of the Heavenly Holy Ghost. The grand differences between Christ and Mahomed are that Mahomed calls himself a mere man, and that God is one, but Christ incorporated himself with God and Mahomed never claimed the power to forgive sins but Jesus did, and the Pope and the Catholic clergy still claim it. Mahomed praised the previous, prophets, but Jesus calls them 'thieves and robbers', (10 J. 8,) an extraordinary statement. Jesus is silent as to the mode of resurrection, the Last Day, and the Trial, but Mahomed is express upon these points. Jesus is silent as to the description of Heaven and Hell, but Mahomed devotes a large part of the Koran to a description of these places. Mahomed legislates but Jesus had no power to legislate. Christ is not followed by his countrymen, but Mahomed is followed not only by his countrymen but by the people of all countries to the north, east, and west of Arabia. The Saracens were at one time the greatest power on earth. Now the Saracens are

nowhere) as excepting Arabia, Morocco, dismembered Turkey, Persia and Afganistan there is no independent Mahomedan country on earth, but formerly they held sway over almost all countries in Asia, north Africa and parts of southern and south eastern Europe. Mahomed gave a great impulse to the Arabs and we know what countries they conquered and what peoples became his followers within three centuries after his birth, and we know that Christians were nowhere during the three centuries after Christ, and but for Constantine and Theodocius, the only two *Greats* among all the Roman emperors, the Christians would have been nowhere. Christ was a religious reformer only and many of his sayings and doings are apocryphal and his personality even has been doubted, but no one has doubted Mahomed's personality or disputed about the genuineness of the Koran, and Mahomed was without doubt, perhaps the greatest all round genius the world has yet produced, though he was illiterate, a most unfortunate circumstance. There are other matters in which Christ and Mahomed differed, but they are of minor importance and I pass them over. I have thus shown the principal matters of difference between Jesus and Mahomed. Mahomed was a legislator as well as a religious reformer, but Jesus was only a religious reformer. The religion of Mahomed was better than that of Jesus as all non-Christians will prefer Unity to Trinity. But Christ's morality is better than that of Mahomed. He never declared war against the infidels, though his followers have burnt infidels and even heretics, and these Christians, who were at first an oppressed people, began to do this when they got the support of the civil power. Further, Mahomed's religion is his, but

Christ's religion is not wholly his own. Its father was Jesus but it was nursed by Paul, but for whom it would have been spread nowhere.

13. Christians are very fond of saying that all progress in Europe in social, literary and political matters is due to the religion of Christ. Now what did Christians do for the progress of mankind during the first 1500 years? They were in total darkness during these fifteen centuries whilst the Saracens were basking in the sun at Bagdad and Cordova. Was there any Augustan Age in Europe for 1500 years after the birth of Christ, whereas the Saracens had theirs at Bagdad during the reign of Caliph Al Mamun (813-833), the son of Haroun Al Rashid, the greatest of the Caliphs? The Saracens who held the lamp of knowledge in those ages literally discovered the science of Chemistry and made many great discoveries in it, and also in astronomy, mathematics and medicine, during those ages. They discovered the preparation of alkali, alembic, alcohol and other drugs, taught spherical trigonometry, solved quadratic and cubic equations, introduced algebra and numerals from India, and optics and hydrostatics were investigated. Geber erected the first astronomical observatory at Seville in 1196, and Avicenna, born in 980, was the greatest medical authority in those ages. They made writing paper in Mecca in 706. They either invented or introduced the pendulum and the mariner's compass into Europe, and who has not heard of the damascus blade and the damascene cloth? They claim to have invented gun powder in the eleventh century. In fact, their literature, art and science form the connecting link between the civilizations of ancient and modern times. To them

we owe the revival of learning and philosophy in Western Europe, and the first awakening of the critical and enquiring spirit that has roused Europe from monkish lethargy and ecclesiastical bigotry. So we owe much to the Arabs; for which we should be grateful and we should not ascribe all present progress to Christianity which is rapidly declining. We should not be ungrateful to them. The first Gothic architecture is in the Mosque of Al Azhar in Cairo. Are there such buildings on earth like the Tajmahal, "a dream in marble", and the Alhambra and were there such cities in the whole world built after Christ's birth and till recent times, as Bagdad, Cordova, Samarkand, Delhi and Agra? We owe all these things to the Moslems when their religion was in full vigour and who were not like the Christians of modern Europe who are from the time of Encyclopaedists shedding off their religion by degrees. Even in matters of science Europeans got much of their learning from the Latin translations made of Arabic works on science. So let no Christian boast of his religion. But for our predecessors we would have been nowhere. Of course we know more than they knew, because to what they have taught us we have added new knowledge. O ye Saracens, while there was total eclipse over the rest of the world, you held the meshal of learning which illumined your country and afterwards modern Europe and through it the rest of the world.

14. The reader will be astonished to hear what the Saracenes were doing for the advancement of learning during the Dark Ages, when they had their Light Ages. The Caliph Al Mamun (813-833) the son of the celebrated Haroun Al Raschid, invited

learned men to his Court at Bagdad, and got many Greek and Sanskrit books translated into Arabic and otherwise encouraged the advancement of learning. His ambassadors at Constantinople, his agents in Armenia, Syria, and Egypt, collected the volumes on Grecian science: at his command they were translated by the most skilful interpreters into the Arabic language: his subjects were exhorted assiduously to peruse these instructive writings; and the successor of Mahomed assisted with pleasure and modesty at the assemblies and disputations of the learned. "He was not ignorant," says, Abdulpharagius, "that they are the elect of God, his best and most useful servants, whose lives are devoted to the improvement of their rational faculties." The zeal and curiosity of Almamun were imitated by succeeding princes of the line of Abbas: their rivals, the Fatimites of Africa and the Omniades of Spain, were the patrons of the learned, as well as the Commanders of the Faithful: the same royal prerogative was claimed by their independent emirs of the provinces; and their emulation diffused the taste and the rewards of science from Samarcand and Bokhara to Fez and Cordova. The vizir of a sultan consecrated the sum of two hundred thousand pieces of gold to the foundation of a college at Bagdad, which he endowed with an annual revenue of fifteen thousand dinars.

15. These Saracens had splendid libraries and prized them highly. "A private doctor refused the invitation of the Sultan of Bokhara, because the carriage of his books would have required four hundred camels. The royal library of the Fatimites consisted of one hundred thousand manuscripts, elegantly transcribed and splendidly bound, which were

lent, without jealousy or avarice, to the students of Cairo. Yet this collection must appear moderate, if we can believe that the Ommiades of Spain had formed a library of six hundred thousand volumes, forty-four of which were employed in the mere catalogue." Gibbon *Ch. 52, Vol. 10, p. 42*. It is doubtful whether the Alexandrian library contained more manuscripts. The old library of the Ptolemies was accidentally burnt down, and the nucleus of the famous library which is said to have contained 700,000 volumes and to have been burnt down by the conqueror Amru under Caliph Omar's order in 640, was the library of the King of Pergamus containing two hundred thousand volumes which was presented to Cleopatra by Mark Antony. Gibbon doubts this burning and makes a countercharge against the Christian crusaders who burnt down a bigger library at Acre. But even if it be true that Amru burnt the library, still it must be remembered that the Arabs were then an illiterate people, and it took place nearly a century before the commencement of Arabic culture. These Saracens made great progress in science, particularly, chemistry, which they practically invented, in mathematics, such as Algebra, philosophy and astronomy. They measured the circumference of the globe and found it to be twenty-four thousand miles, and without glasses they observed the stars, prepared the astronomical tables of Bagdad, Spain and Samarcand, and corrected some minute errors of Ptolemy. As regards Universities they had them at Bagdad, Cordova and Samarcand, and the University called Al Azhar which still exists, was founded in the tenth century in a mosque which is one of the earliest examples of Gothic architecture whereas the great University of Paris upon which the

Universities of Oxford and the continent were modelled was founded two centuries later. The Universities of Cordova, Bagdad and Samarcand were famous for the teaching of medicine and the names of Mesua, Geber, Razis and Avicenna, the greatest medical men in the Middle Ages, are ranked with the Grecian masters. This Avicenna "reduced the science of medicine to a systematic form, including almost everything that had been written on the subject by his predecessors: he was versed in Greek literature, and is said to have committed Aristotle's *Metaphysics* to memory." *Taylor's History of the Transmission of Ancient Books* p. 83. In the city of Bagdad, eight hundred and sixty physicians were licensed to exercise their profession and the school of Salerno their legitimate offspring founded in the ninth century revived in Italy and Europe the precepts of the healing art, and this University claims to be the oldest University in Europe. But alas! Where are the Arabic Universities gone? Such are the vicissitudes of fortune. Excepting Al Azhar all the other Universities are gone, and this University is now concerned only with the Koran and religious literature and philosophy. The world is advancing, but these Saracens are standing still or rather going backwards and after the Renaissance they have not produced anything which is read by scholars now-a-days. Greek and Latin are read in European Colleges, Sanscrit is taught also there and particularly in the Universities of Germany where it gave birth to the Science of Language but where in Europe is Arabic Literature taught. Scholars read the Koran and other important religious books but not any Arabic work on philosophy, science and astronomy. Al Gazaly's

name and philosophy had found a place in the first editions of Lewes' *History of Philosophy*, but later editions have removed his name. Such is the respect of the moderns for Arabic literature and philosophy.

16. Now, what did the Christians do for the progress of mankind in the first fifteen centuries after Christ's birth? Mr. E. P. Meredith says in his *Prophet of Nazareth* pp. 227, 231, that the Christians were accused of murdering infants, of committing adultery, incest and other vices in their secret love feasts. The females of Damascus, once Christians, confessed that they were privy to those criminal acts and said that Christians did these licentious acts in their very churches. The Emperor Hadrian, in a letter to his brother-in-law Servianus in the year 131 says "there is no presbyter of the Christians who is not either an astrologer, a sooth-sayer or a minister of obscene pleasures." Tacitus says that Nero punished the Christians "as they were held in abhorrence for their crimes", and they were "odious to mankind". In their Agapae they ate human flesh after murdering infants. *Vide Justin Martyr, Apology, 1. 35. Irenaeus Against Heretics 1. 24, Clement of Alexandria 1. 3.* Tertullian says that they were guilty of incest. This matter is very ably dealt with by Mrs. Besant in her book on *Christianity* pp. 222-227.

17. The Christians during these fifteen centuries only wrote books on religion, quarrelled amongst themselves about religious dogmas, suppressed heresies, instituted the Inquisition, made wars of religion and suppressed vigorously all attempts at discoveries in science. They produced very few

great authors or scientists. The 'Dark Ages' prove that Christianity did very little for Europe. So we should not ascribe European progress to Christianity. It was the Renaissance and the revival of Greek learning, caused by the dispersion of the Greeks consequent upon Turkish invasion and conquest of Greece in 1453, the invention of printing about 1450 and the consequent multiplication of books, the discovery of Columbus in 1492 and that of Vasco de Gama in 1498, the invasion of Italy by Charles VIII in 1498, which event, according to Hallam, closed the Middle Ages,—all these events, which occurred in the same century, have reformed and enlightened Christians, who were for at least 1000 years steeped in gross ignorance and bigotry, and Europe waked from its long slumber when the prevalent religion began to show signs of decline. In fact the rise of Modern Europe is synchronous with the downfall of Catholicism, and it is to be observed that the more Christianity has declined the more advanced Europe has become in intellectual and material progress, and it is a remarkable fact in the history of mankind that the decline of orthodoxy has caused the progress of the people, so that they are on opposite scales and the rise or fall of one scale causes the fall or rise of the other. Look to our own country. Hinduism, orthodox Hinduism, is in the agony of death and the country is prospering both intellectually and materially, and when castehood, the last citadel of Brahminism, will go, and it has gone to a great extent, Hindus will be a great nation. So long India was steeped in total ignorance. All Hindus believed that the sun and the solid vault of the heavens went round the earth, and the sun took its rest at

night, that the earth is a rectangular cube, that there are seven heavens above and seven hells below the earth, that the inferior gods resided in the lower heavens and that Indra, the chief god, resided in the seventh and highest heaven surrounded by a bevy of celestial nymphs. In the last century we were taught to believe that the sky was originally very low, and when an old bent up woman was sweeping the court yard it constantly touched her back and she gave it such a hard blow with her broom that it rose up in the heavens and has remained there ever since. My long life has enabled me to see the progress of education and with it the rapid decline of Hinduism, or rather Brahminism, and I sometimes laugh and sometimes grieve at the gross ignorance and superstition of my grandmother and her contemporaries, as no woman was permitted to read as that would have caused widowhood. I saw the influence of the priests and I see it now. Then they were lords of creation. Now they are beggars at our door and subsist solely on our charity. It is therefore my belief from study and experience extending over three quarters of a century that man will improve in proportion as orthodoxy will decrease, and there will be millennium when the distinctions of race, colour and creed will vanish, and not till then. Look to the four corners of Europe, Ireland Spain and Turkey are very orthodox and Russia till the other day was very orthodox. And they are the most backward countries in Europe, though following different faiths or belonging to different branches of the same faith. Turkey is improving because it has practically abolished orthodoxy and Russia will improve because it has abolished its old.

religion. Europe was dark when religion was supreme and is seeing light when it is vanishing. Formerly people were compelled to attend church or to pay a penalty. Now most churches are empty. Let the State withdraw its aid from the church and the fat bishoprics will vanish and attendance at churches will be reduced by half, as priests support religion and religion supports priests in all countries of the world. Look at the history of old Egypt, where priests were supreme, down to that of India of to-day, where priests are still supreme among the masses. In Egypt, in Arabia, in Catholic Europe and in India priests had their first fruits and this privilege still prevails in Catholic countries and India.

18. I have shewn above that the intellectual progress of modern Europe is not due to Christianity which had been existing in full vigour for fifteen centuries and debasing the Christians, intellectually and morally, nor is the modern material progress of Europe due to Christianity, but it is due to the progress of science, which the Church had been rigorously suppressing during the Middle Ages. I have also shewn above that the Moslems of Bagdad and Cordova, during the same self centuries were making immense progress in the intellectual field, and in science and art, so that while during the Middle Ages the Christians were sleeping, the Moslems were making great strides both in intellect and material progress. But after the close of the Middle Ages the Christians began to make great progress in both spheres, and the Moslems have stood still since that time. In fact they have not made any progress during the last three hundred years. This remark applies to all Mahomedan countri

The Moslems of the Barbary States were professional pirates until the French conquered Algeria in the last century. Morocco is still a semi barbarous State. Egypt owes much of its recent progress to the English occupation since 1882. Arabia, the native land of Mahomed is the land of Bedouin robbers, who are often denounced by Mahomed in the Koran, and who even now plunder and murder pilgrims to the holy city. In fact, I doubt if Arabia has much advanced since Mahomed's time, though there is a yearly influx of many civilized people to that country. The Turks were till a decade ago called 'unspeakable.' Their Bulgarian atrocities in 1876 brought on the Russo Turkish war and in the last Great War the Turks massacred thousands of innocent Armenians. Turkey has no national literature yet. It copied from Persian models till the middle of the last century. Its poetry consisted of imitations of Persian gazls or love songs, and it is only since the middle of the last century, that the Turks have begun to copy French models, and it is from the French that Turkish youths have imbibed political ideas and Turkey has become the first Republic in point of time among all Mahomedan countries, principally through imbibing French ideas. It is now rapidly advancing and is now the most advanced Moslem country, but it has shed off a bit of its religion, as it has made polygamy an offence in the teeth of Mahomed's law of marriage (*Ch. 4 v. 3*) and has lifted the veil of the ladies against the injunction of the Koran (*Ch. 24 vs. 31, 59, Ch. 33 vs. 53, 55, 59*). As to Persia it was the country of Firdousi, Hafiz, Omar Khayam, Sadi and other famous poets, but they died long ago and Persia has

long ceased to produce good poets, and as to its material progress in recent times it is almost nil. It is a strange fact that within the last five centuries no Mahomedan country has produced a great man of science and as to Arabic poetry, its greatest poet flourished so long ago as the 13th century and since the death of Al Gazaly who died in 1111, the Saracens have produced no great philosopher. I have in the preceding passages, taken a bird's eye view of all Mahomedan countries. I had resolved not to speak of Indian Moslems, as they are my brethren and I have no antipathy against them. I prefer their Unity to the Parsee Duality, the latter to the Christian Trinity and this last to the Hindu three hundred and thirty millionity, if I might be permitted to coin a new word. In fact there are more gods than men in India, Hindus and Moslems combined. I regard them as my brethren and they are my countrymen. But I am very sorry at their backwardness. I have never heard of any recent book worth reading written by an Indian Mahomedan on any subject other than a Mahomedan subject. Hindus and Mahomedans had their Augustan Age. That was long ago, more than a thousand years ago. But the Hindus have shaken off the yoke of priestly ignorance and have written works on scientific, historical and antiquarian subjects, but no Indian Mahomedan has ventured to do so. Rise up, my Mahomedan countrymen, rise, my brothers and try to rival the Hindus. Why should you be left behind in the struggle for existence? The race is for the swiftest. Try to be as intelligent and learned as the Hindus. The Hindus are advancing because they have shed off many injunctions of their shastras, such as the prohibition to cross

the "black waters" and their women have to a great extent lifted their veils and appear before the public and the caste system has been to a great extent abolished. I know that Mahomedan ladies are anxious to lift their veils and appear in public. Let them have their will and follow in the footsteps of their Hindu sisters. Let Hindus and Mahomedans mutually meet one another, and remove all social barriers, let Mahomedans abolish polygamy, and reform some portions of their laws as the Hindus are doing, let there be intermarriage between Hindus and Mahomedans, and let them interdine and this interdining and intermarriage will make them one nation and there will be also communal peace. I do not wish to say anything regarding politics which I have studiously avoided. But that day will be a glorious one when Hindus and Mahomedans will be an unified nation and the unity of one fifth of the entire human race is a thing which should be aimed at by every son of India. Ameen.

Abrogation of verses (nearly 220).

Ch. 2 v. 100, Ch. 13 v. 39, Ch. 16 v. 103.

Adam.

Ch. 20 vs. 115-121 (fall), Ch. 7 v. 18, Ch. 2 v. 34.

Adoption.

Ch. 33 vs. 4, 5, 37.

Adultery.

Ch. 4 vs. 19, 30, Ch. 17 v. 34, Ch. 24 v. 6,
Ch. 33 v. 30.

Alms-giving.

Ch. 2 vs. 211, 269, 273, 275, 277, Ch. 3 v. 128,
Ch. 24 v. 55, Ch. 57 vs. 7, 17, Ch. 58 vs. 13-14,
Ch. 64 vs. 16, 17, Ch. 30 v. 38.

Angels.

Ch. 8 vs. 9-10 (Beder), Ch. 40 v. 7 (bear God's throne), Ch. 86 v. 4 (guardian angel), Ch. 3 v. 120 (3000 at Beder), Ch. 8 v. 9 (1000), Ch. 69 v. 17 (bear God's throne), Ch. 40 v. 7 (intercede), Ch. 43 v. 3 do, Ch. 39 v. 68 (die), Ch. 13 v. 12 (watch over man), Ch. 8 v. 9 (fighting) v. 12 (guardian), Ch. 6 v. 61 (watch over man), Ch. 16 v. 59 (daughters of God), Ch. 17 v. 42 do, Ch. 37 v. 150 do, Ch. 43 v. 18, Ch. 53 v. 28, Ch. 74 v. 30, (guard Hell), Ch. 6 v. 61 (of death), Ch. 7 v. 35, Ch. 16 v. 30, Ch. 32 v. 11, Ch. 47 v. 29. •

Animals, resurrection of.

Ch. 6 v. 38.

Apostacy capital offence.

Ch. 4 v. 91.

Apostles treated as liars.

Ch. 3 v. 181.

Ayesha left behind.

Ch. 24 vs. 4-19.

Balance.

Ch. 7 vs. 7-8, Ch. 23 vs. 104-5, Ch. 57 v. 25,
Ch. 101 vs. 5-6, Ch. 21 v. 48.

Beasts and Birds at Resurrection.

Ch. 6 v. 38.

Beder, battle of (God's assistance in).

Ch. 8 vs. 9, 10, 17, Ch. 3 vs. 11, 119-121.

Book of God's decrees and men's actions.

Ch. 6 v. 59, Ch. 17 vs. 14-15, Ch. 50 vs. 16, 17
(angels record all), Ch. 83 vs. 7-9 wicked acts
recorded in Sijjin (hell prison), Ch. 3 v. 139,
Ch. 78 v. 29 (we wrote down all), Ch. 84 v. 7
(book in right hand of the blessed) v. 10 (behind
back of condemned), Ch. 69 v. 19 (book in right
hand) v. 25 (left hand), Ch. 17 v. 73 (right hand),
Ch. 3 v. 177 (we will surely write down their
sayings), Ch. 22 v. 69, Ch. 4 v. 135, Ch. 87 v. 3,
Ch. 64 v. 2, Ch. 57 v. 22, Ch. 50 v. 4.

Booty, see Spoils.

Caaba.

Ch. 22 v. 27 (built by Abraham), Ch. 2 vs.
119-121.

Cave.

Ch. 18 vs. 8, et seq.

Challenge to produce similar sūra.

Ch. 2 v. 21, Ch. 11 v. 16 Ch. 10 v. 39, Ch. 17
v. 90.

Christ, see Jesus.

Christians.

Ch. 2 v. 59, Ch. 5 v. 73, Ch. 4 v. 169, Ch. 9 vs. 29-30, (fight against), Ch. 5 v. 73 (no fear), Ch. 5 vs. 56, 76, 77 (infidels), Ch. 3 v. 79 (fate).

Contribution to spread Islam.

Ch. 2 v. 192 (for war), Ch. 4 v. 97.

Creation in six days.

Ch. 50 v. 37, Ch. 25 v. 60, Ch. 41 vs. 8-11, Ch. 11 v. 9, Ch. 10 v. 3, Ch. 7 v. 53, Ch. 39 vs. 7-8, Ch. 7 v. 178 (many men and jinns created for hell).

David made coats of mail.

Ch. 21 v. 80, Ch. 34 v. 10.

Deeds, reward according to.

Ch. 45 vs. 13, 21, 27, Ch. 16 vs. 99, 112, Ch. 28 v. 84, Ch. 6 vs. 69, 161, Ch. 2 v. 281, Ch. 3 v. 24.

Deluge.

Ch. 69 v. 11.

Divorce.

Ch. 2 vs. 226-238, Ch. 4 v. 24, Ch. 33 v. 48, Ch. 58 v. 4, Ch. 65 vs. 1, 2, 6, Ch. 11 v. 120 (good and bad), Ch. 72 v. 11 do.

Djinn, created of fire.

Ch. 15 v. 27, Ch. 55 v. 14.

Earths, seven.

Ch. 65 v. 12, Ch. 41 v. 8 (created in two days).

Eblis disobeys God's order.

Ch. 7 v. 10-18, Ch. 2 v. 32, Ch. 17 vs. 63-67, Ch. 18 v. 48, Ch. 38 vs. 71-86, Ch. 20 vs. 115-121, Ch. 15 v. 31-42.

Eden.

Ch. 2 v. 34 (Adam banished from), Ch. 9 v. 73, Ch. 13 v. 23, Ch. 18 v. 30, Ch. 61 v. 12, Ch. 35 v. 30.

Elephant.

Ch. 105.

Ever virgins in heaven.

Ch. 56 v. 35.

Faith and good works.

Ch. 16 v. 99.

Fasting.

Ch. 2 vs. 179-183.

Fatalism, see also predestination.

Ch. 3 v. 139, Ch. 87 v. 3, Ch. 8 v. 17, Ch. 9 v. 51,

Ch. 13 v. 30, Ch. 14 v. 4, Ch. 18 v. 81.

Friday.

Ch. 62 v. 9 (day of Assembly).

Gabriel.

Ch. 16 v. 104, Ch. 66 v. 4, Ch. 81 v. 19, Ch. 2 vs.

81, 91 (enemy of the Jews), Ch. 53 vs. 5, 6, 10,

(bearer of Revelation), Ch. 81 v. 23.

God.

Ch. 2 v. 256 (only one), Ch. 3 v. 1 do, Ch. 4 v.

90 (misleads), Ch. 4 v. 169 (Trinity), Ch. 5 v. 77

(do and Unity), Ch. 6 vs. 59-60, 125, (misleads),

Ch. 3 v. 29 (loves and forgives Moslems), Ch. 7

v. 177, Ch. 8 v. 17, (slew enemies at Beder),

Ch. 16 vs. 39, 95 (misleads), Ch. 40 v. 74

(misleads), Ch. 47 v. 21 (one), Ch. 53 v. 1-4

(God's oath by star that Koran is revealed),

Ch. 56 vs. 24-27 do, Ch. 57 v. 3 (omniscient),

Ch. 59 vs. 22-23 do, Ch. 61 v. 4 (loves fighters

for Him), Ch. 112 vs. 3-4, Ch. 44 v. 15 (venge-

ance), Ch. 14 v. 48 do, Ch. 5 v. 45 (misleads),

Ch. 39 v. 24 do, Ch. 11 v. 35 do, Ch. 40 v. 35

do, Ch. 35 v. 9 do, Ch. 7 v. 185, do, Ch. 6 v. 39

do, Ch. 4 v. 90 do, Ch. 3 v. 9 (severe in punish-

ing), Ch. 8 v. 17, (slew at Beder), Ch. 7 v. 178

(many djinns and men created for hell), Ch. 13 v. 12, Ch. 19 vs. 1-3 (oath), Ch. 90 vs. 1-3 (God's oath), Ch. 81 v. 15 do, Ch. 6 v. 108 (revile not God—22 Ex. 28), Ch. 37 v. 4 one), Ch. 20 v. 7, Ch. 7 v. 179 (His names), Ch. 6 v. 101 (Creator), Ch. 50 v. 37 (unwearied by creation), Ch. 2 (His power), Ch. 3 v. 159 do, Ch. 24 v. 35, (is a light), Ch. 67 v. 3 (perfect in His works), Ch. 15 v. 20 (provides for all, Ch. 17 vs. 21, 32 do, Ch. 18 v. 109 (His words are countless), Ch. 31 v. 26 do, Ch. 3 v. 3 (the avenger), Ch. 5 v. 96 do, Ch. 10 v. 100 do, Ch. 2 v. 110 (has no offspring), Ch. 6 v. 100 do, Ch. 19 v. 36, 91-93 do, Ch. 21 v. 26 do, Ch. 37 v. 149, do, Ch. 39 v. 6 do, Ch. 72 v. 3 do, Ch. 6 v. 101 (because He has no wife), Ch. 48 v. 23 (changes not), Ch. 51 v. 56 (created all beings to adore Him), Ch. 42 v. 50 (how He speaks with men), Ch. 13 v. 27 (leads and misleads, Ch. 61 v. 5 do, Ch. 14 v. 4, 32 (His decrees), Ch. 91 v. 8 (is author of good and evil deeds), Ch. 4 v. 81 (and yet good is from Him, evil from men), Ch. 58 v. 8 do, Ch. 6 v. 103 (all seeing but unseen), Ch. 57 v. 6 do, Ch. 44 v. 5 (all hearing), Ch. 3 v. 28 (gracious), Ch. 112 v. 2 (eternal), Ch. 4 v. 146 (grateful), Ch. 6 v. 103 (subtle), Ch. 27 v. 40 (self-sufficient), Ch. 35 v. 27 do, Ch. 2 v. 265 (never sleeps).

Harut and Marut (angels).

Ch. 2 v. 96.

Heaven described.

Ch. 4 v. 60 (described), Ch. 7 vs. 44-45 (partition wall in hell), vide 16 L. 26, Ch. 9 v. 73, Ch. 35 v. 30, Ch. 36 vs. 52-57, Ch. 37 vs. 38-47, Ch. 55, Ch. 56. . .

Heaven for believers.

Ch. 2 v. 59, Ch. 3 v. 103; Ch. 4 v. 60, Ch. 9 vs. 73, 112, Ch. 39 v. 73, Ch. 2 v. 149 (for fighters), Ch. 3 v. 163-164 do.

Heavens, seven.

Ch. 67 v. 3, Ch. 2 v. 27, Ch. 31 v. 33, Ch. 21 v. 31 (once solid), Ch. 25 v. 27, (cleft on Last Day), Ch. 78 v. 12 (seven solid heavens), Ch. 23 v. 17, Ch. 41 v. 11 (created in two days), Ch. 17 v. 46, Ch. 65 v. 12, Ch. 21 v. 33 (heaven's roof), Ch. 69 v. 17, Ch. 81 v. 1, Ch. 77 v. 9, Ch. 17 v. 46.

Hell described.

Ch. 14 v. 19-20, Ch. 15 v. 44 (seven portals), Ch. 74 v. 30, Ch. 19 v. 78, Ch. 57 v. 13, Ch. 7 v. 44 (partition wall Al Araf).

Hell for infidels.

Ch. 3 vs. 112, 156, Ch. 4 v. 59, (fresh skin each time, then burnt). Ch. 7 v. 34 (for ever), Ch. 2 v. 22, Ch. 7 v. 178 (many djinns and men created for hell), Ch. 8 vs. 15-16 (lot of fugitive soldiers), Ch. 9 vs. 17, 74, Ch. 14 vs. 19-20, Ch. 15 v. 44, Ch. 17 v. 74, Ch. 2 v. 156, Ch. 11 v. 109 (for ever), Ch. 6 v. 128 do.

Idolatry.

Ch. 4 v. 51 (unpardonable sin), Ch. 7 vs. 191-192, Ch. 4 v. 116 do, Ch. 2 v. 107, Ch. 25 v. 3, Ch. 28 vs. 62-74, Ch. 9 v. 28 (idolaters unclean), Ch. 9 vs. 114-115 (idolaters not to be prayed for).

Idols cannot create.

Ch. 7 vs. 191, 192.

Illiterate prophet.

Ch. 7 vs. 156, 158.

Imposture, charge of.

Ch. 3 v. 181, Ch. 29 v. 27, Ch. 6 v. 21, Ch. 11 vs. 16, 37, Ch. 25 vs. 5-6, Ch. 32 v. 2, Ch. 34 vs. 7, 8, Ch. 23 vs. 46, 50, Ch. 77 vs. 15-49, Ch. 16 v. 105, Ch. 35 v. 4, Ch. 5 v. 13, Ch. 13 v. 27 (sign demanded), Ch. 10 v. 39, Ch. 52 vs. 33-34, Ch. 2 v. 21, Ch. 35 v. 23, Ch. 46 v. 7.

Infanticide forbidden.

Ch. 6 v. 141, Ch. 17 v. 33.

Infidels.

Ch. 2 vs. 186-187, 189, 245, Ch. 9 vs. 5, 29, 36, 74, Ch. 47 vs. 4-5 (make great slaughter, then take prisoners), Ch. 66 v. 9, Ch. 8 v. 12 (cut off heads), Ch. 4 vs. 76 (reward for fighting against), Ch. 4 v. 86, Ch. 4 v. 93 (fight till terms of peace proposed and kill), Ch. 86 v. 17 (deal calmly with).

Infidels not friends.

Ch. 3 vs. 24, 114 (form no intimacy with them), Ch. 4 vs. 62, 91, Ch. 4 v. 102 (enemies), Ch. 4 v. 143, Ch. 5 v. 56 (no friendship with Jews and Christians), Ch. 9 v. 23 (no intimacy with infidel father, brother etc)

Intercessor, none on Day of Judgment.

Ch. 9 v. 46, Ch. 2 vs. 45, 117, 254, Ch. 6 v. 164, Ch. 16 v. 112, Ch. 19 v. 90, Ch. 34 v. 22, Ch. 82 v. 19, Ch. 17 v. 16, Ch. 3 v. 49, Ch. 10 v. 28.

Islam, contribution to spread.

Ch. 2 v. 192, Ch. 4 v. 97.

Islam true religion.

Ch. 3 vs. 17, 29, 79.

Jesus.

Ch. 3 v. 48 (to die), Ch. 4 v. 156 (not crucified), Ch. 66 v. 12 (conception), Ch. 5 v. 79 (mere

apostle), Ch. 19 v. 34 (to die) Ch. 19 vs. 16-35
 palm tree), Ch. 19 v. 109 (made birds of clay),
 Ch. 21 v. 91 (conception), Ch. 43 v. 57 do, Ch.
 43 v. 63 do; Ch. 3 v. 73 (His divinity denied),
 Ch. 19 vs. 23-24 (birth of, Ch. 2 vs. 81, 254,
 Ch. 5 v. 50, Ch. 6 v. 85, Ch. 23 v. 52, Ch. 57.
 v. 27, Ch. 61 vs. 6, 14, Ch. 4 v. 169 (mere
 apostle).

Jews.

Ch. 5 v. 73 (Jews, Christians & Sabeites have
 no fear), Ch. 5 v. 85 (enemies to Moslems), Ch.
 5 vs. 48, 49 (their Lex talionis), Ch. 4 v. 155
 (their calumnies against Virgin Mary), Ch. 4
 v. 50 (punishment in store for them), Ch. 5 v.
 69 do, Ch. 2 vs. 95, 96 (scriptures perverted by),
 Ch. 4 v. 48 do, Ch. 2 v. 59 (favoured), Ch. 29
 v. 45 do, Ch. 9 v. 30 (God fights against), Ch.
 3 v. 79, Ch. 5 v. 56 (no friendship with), Ch. 5
 vs. 76, 77, Ch. 9 vs. 29, 30 (fight against).

Kebla.

Ch. 2 vs. 109, 136-145.

Koran, revealed.

Ch. 43 vs. 2-3, Ch. 53 vs. 4, 10 (by Gabriel), Ch.
 56 v. 79, Ch. 45 v. 1, Ch. 7 v. 1, Ch. 46 vs. 1,
 8, Ch. 25 v. 34 (sent in parcels), Ch. 4 v. 84,
 Ch. 13 vs. 37, 39, Ch. 10 v. 17. Ch. 17 v.
 107.

Koran, where and by whom written.

Ch. 85 vs. 21-22 (written on preserved table).

Koran, why Arabic.

Ch. 13 v. 37, Ch. 41 v. 44, Ch. 43 v. 2 (that ye
 may understand), Ch. 44 v. 58 do, Ch. 19 v. 97
 do, Ch. 16 v. 105, Ch. 20 v. 112, Ch. 26 v. 195,
 Ch. 12 v. 2, Ch. 62 v. 2 (God hath sent to

the pagan Arabs an apostle from among themselves)

Last Day.

Ch. 22 v. 1 (earthquake), Ch. 25 v. 27 (heavens cleft), Ch. 17 v. 73, Ch. 36 v. 51-7 (trumpet), Ch. 69 v. 18, Ch. 69 v. 16 (heavens cleft), Ch. 82 v. 1, Ch. 77 v. 9, Ch. 14 v. 49, Ch. 56 vs. 4, 5, 6, Ch. 81 vs. 1-14, Ch. 82 vs. 1-4, Ch. 99 vs. 1-2.

Laws.

Ch. 4 v. 19 (adultery), Ch. 5 v. 42 (theft), Ch. 5 v. 49 (eye for eye etc.), Ch. 4 v. 3 (four wives), Ch. 60. v. 10 (wives of infidels), Ch. 2 v. 173, Ch. 4 vs. 27-30, (marriage), Ch. 4 vs. 12-15 (male and female), Ch. 4 v. 175, (distant kindred), Ch. 65 v. 1 (divorce).

Lex talionis.

Ch. 5 v. 49 (= 21 Ex. 23-27), Ch. 2 v. 173.

Mahomed.

Ch. 7 vs. 156, 158 illiterate. Ch. 62 vs. 9-11 left alone when preaching in mosque Ch. 29 vs. 17, 49, Ch. 7 vs. 183, 188, Ch. 46 v. 8, Ch. 18 v. 110, Ch. 25 v. 58, Ch. 41 v. 5, Ch. 17 v. 95, Ch. 3 v. 138, Ch. 48 v. 29, Ch. 3 v. 19, Ch. 4 v. 169, Ch. 33 v. 40, Ch. 5 v. 99, man and apostle only. Ch. 62 v. 2 (God has sent an apostle from among the Arabs), Ch. 48 v. 2 (his sins forgiven).

Man and Woman.

Ch. 4 v. 38 man superior), Ch. 4 v. 123, (both go to paradise). Ch. 16 v. 99 (males and females go to heaven).

Man, creation of.

Ch. 55 v. 13 (made of clay), Ch. 23 v. 12 do,

- Ch. 15 v. 26 do, Ch. 38 v. 71, do Ch. 6 v. 2 do, Ch. 3 v. 52 (from dust), Ch. 16 v. 4 do, Ch. 24 v. 44 (of water), Ch. 25 v. 56 do, Ch. 96 v. 2 (from clots of blood), Ch. 11 v. 69 (from dust), Ch. 35 v. 12 do.

Marriage.

- Ch. 2 v. 220 (with idolaters forbidden), Ch. 4 v. 3 (four wives besides slaves), Ch. 4 vs. 26-30 (prohibited degrees).

Mary Copt.

- Ch. 66 vs. 1-3 (Mahomed released from oath).

Mary Virgin, Aaron's sister.

- Ch. 66 v. 12, Ch. 19 v. 29.

Meat.

- Ch. 5 v. 4 (swine, blood etc.), Ch. 5 v. 97 (fish), Ch. 16 v. 116, Ch. 6 vs. 118, 121 (meat forbidden unless killed in God's name).

Mecca and Meccans.

- Ch. 50 v. 2 (Meccans addressed), Ch. 2 v. 19 do, Ch. 37 v. 11 do, Ch. 95 v. 3 (inviolable soil, see Pliny VI. 32), Ch. 22 v. 1 (addressed).

Miracles, why not performed.

- Ch. 3 vs. 180-181, Ch. 29 v. 49, Ch. 17 v. 61.

Miscellaneous.

- Ch. 49 vs. 2-3 (speak less loud than the apostle), Ch. 49 vs. 4, 5 (visitors to wait when Mahomed is inside), Ch. 62 v. 9 (Friday observance), Ch. 96 vs. 1-5 (first revealed verses), Ch. 17 v. 35 (kill murderers leniently), Ch. 49 v. 11 (no nick names), Ch. 49 v. 12 (don't traduce in absence).

Months.

- Ch. 9 v. 5 (sacred months), Ch. 9 v. 56 (twelve).

Night journey.

- Ch. 17 v. 1 et seq.

Ohod, battle of.

Ch. 3 vs. 131-165.

Paradise.

Ch. 35 v. 32 (no toil in), Ch. 47 vs. 16 17 (fruits and rivers of milk, honey and wine).

Parents, duties towards.

Ch. 17 vs. 24-25, Ch. 31 v. 13 (child weaned after 2 years), Ch. 46 v. 14.

Pharaoh drowned.

Ch. 8 v. 56.

Pilgrimage.

Ch. 3 v. 90 (Caaba oldest temple), Ch. 3 v. 91, Ch. 5 v. 98, Ch. 2 vs. 153, 192, 193, Ch. 22 vs. 28-30, Ch. 5 v. 2, Ch. 95 v. 3 (Mecca's soil inviolate, see Pliny VI. 32).

Prayer.

Ch. 3 v. 191 (forgive us), Ch. 7 v. 150 (forgive me and my brother), Ch. 9 v. 85 (no prayer for the dead), Ch. 29 v. 44 (prayer restraineth from the filthy and the blameworthy), Ch. 2 vs. 109, 172 (no Kebla necessary), Ch. 2 vs. 139, 144, 145, (pray towards Caaba), Ch. 4 v. 102 (cut short in war), Ch. 9 v. 114 (pray not for infidels), Ch. 17 v. 80 (times), Ch. 20 v. 130 (five times, Rodwell p. 49 gives the hours of prayer, 1. Sunset, 2. When quite dark, 3. Daybreak, 4. A little after noon, 5. Before nightfall), Ch. 5 vs. 8-9 (washings before prayer), Ch. 16 v. 127 (patience is better than reprisals), Ch. 47 v. 21 (ask pardon for thy sin and for believers both men and women), Ch. 4 v. 46 (times), Ch. 11 v. 116, Ch. 29 v. 44 (purifies), Ch. 50 v. 39 (times), Ch. 2 v. 286 (for victory over infidels).

Precepts.

.Ch. 49 v. 12 (avoid suspicion, do not traduce another in his absence), Ch. 3 v. 128 (master anger, forgive others), Ch. 5 v. 35 (slayer of one man is slayer of mankind), Ch. 92 vs. 18-21 (who giveth away his substance that he may become pure and who offereth not favours to any one for the sake of recompense but only as seeking the face of his Lord the Most High and surely in the end he shall be well content), Ch. 23 v. 98 ("Turn aside evil with that which is better") Ch. 2 v. 257 ("Let there be no compulsion in religion"), Ch. 6 v. 108 ("Revile not those whom they call on beside God least they in their ignorance spitefully revile Him = 22 Ex. 28"), Ch. 7 v. 150 ("Oh Lord forgive me and my brother and bring us into thy mercy"), Ch. 3 v. 129 (implore forgiveness of your sins), Ch. 41 v. 34-36 ("Moreover, good and evil are not to be treated as the same thing. Turn away evil by what is better, and lo! he between whom and thyself was enmity, shall be as though he were a warm friend. But none attain to this save men steadfast in patience, and none attain to it except the most highly favoured. And if an enticement from Satan entice thee, then take refuge in God, for He is the Hearing and Knowing"), Ch. 3 v. 191 ("O our Lord! forgive us then our sin, and hide away from us our evil deeds, and cause us to die with the righteous"), Ch. 6 v. 153 (Do not rob the substance of the orphans but improve it, when giving judgment, observe justice though a kinsman's affair), Ch. 42 v. 38

(forgiveness recommended), Ch. 10 v. 27 (goodness and good acts recommended), Ch. 4 v. 40 (kindness to parents, orphans etc.).

Predestination.

Ch. 87 v. 3, Ch. 17 vs. 14, 15, Ch. 15 v. 5, Ch. 3 vs. 139, 148, Ch. 6 v. 2, Ch. 64 v. 2 (St. Paul in 8 Rom. 29-30, 1 Eph. 5, 11, 1 (1 Pet.) 2). Ch. 57 v. 22.

Prophecy.

Ch. 30 vs. 1-3 (about future Greek victory).

Prophets, names of.

Ch. 7 (six only), Chs. 11 & 37 (seven only, Abraham added).

Religion, one only if God had willed.

Ch. 10 v. 99.

Resurrection.

Ch. 17 v. 53 (nigh), Ch. 6 v. 38 (of beasts etc.), Ch. 20 v. 15 (hour is coming), Ch. 14 v. 49, Ch. 27 v. 89, Ch. 39 vs. 67-73.

Resurrection proved by rain and day and night.

Ch. 43 v. 10, Ch. 50 vs. 9-11, Ch. 16 v. 67, Ch. 22 vs. 5-6, Ch. 36 vs. 33, 37, Ch. 35 v. 10, Ch. 3 v. 26 (day and night), Ch. 2 v. 158 (rain and night), Ch. 30 v. 49.

Revelation.

Ch. 25 v. 34 (in parcels), Ch. 17 v. 107 do, Ch. 85 vs. 21-22 (written on preserved table), Ch. 4 v. 138, Ch. 6 v. 67, Ch. 18 v. 1, Ch. 46 v. 1.

Reward after death according to good works.

Ch. 23 v. 104, 105, Ch. 7 vs. 7-8, Ch. 48 v. 54, (double reward for renegade Jews and Christians), Ch. 18 v. 44, Ch. 16 v. 112, Ch. 43 v. 44, Ch. 14 v. 51, Ch. 2 vs. 281-286.

Sabbath, none.

Ch. 50 vs. 14, 37.

Sacrifice, for piety only.

Ch. 22 vs. 37-38.

Satan see Eblis.

Scriptures falsified by Jews and Christians.

Ch. 2 vs. 39, 73.

Seven Sleepers.

Ch. 18 v. 8.

Sin, pardon of, asked for.

Ch. 40 v. 57 (seek pardon), Ch. 47 v. 21 (ask pardon for thy sins and for believers, both men and women), Ch. 48 vs. 1-2 (Mahomed's faults forgiven), Ch. 110 v. 3 (implore pardon).

Slaves.

Ch. 23 v. 6 (enjoy slaves), Ch. 23 v. 49 (slaves allowed to Mahomed), Ch. 4 v. 29 (marry captured slaves), Ch. 70 v. 30 (union with slaves allowed).

Soul.

Ch. 17 v. 87.

Spirit.

Ch. 4 v. 169 (God's spirit conveyed to Mary), Ch. 2 v. 81 (Holy Spirit in Jesus), v. 254 do, Ch. 16 v. 104.

Spoils, Mahomed's share in.

Ch. 8 vs. 1, 42 (one fifth share for God and His apostle), Ch. 59 v. 7 (spoils belong to God, and His apostle, to his kindred, orphans, poor, wayfarer).

Stars fall.

Ch. 81 v. 2, Ch. 82 v. 2.

Statues and images forbidden.

Ch. 5 v. 92.

Table, miracle of the,

Ch. 5 vs. 112-115.

Table, preserved.

Ch. 85 vs. 21-22, Ch. 56 v. 76.

Testament.

Ch. 2 v. 176, Ch. 5 v. 105.

Theft.

Ch. 5 v. 42.

Throne, God's.

Ch. 2 v. 256 (touches heaven and earth).

Toleration.

Ch. 2 v. 257 (Let there be no compulsion in religion), Ch. 86 v. 17 (Deal calmly therefore with infidels, leave them awhile alone), Ch. 6 v. 108 (Reville not those whom they call on beside God), Comp. 22 Ex. 28.

Trinitarians.

Ch. 5 v. 77 (infidels), Ch. 4 v. 169.

Trumpet.

Ch. 23 v. 163, Ch. 36 v. 51, Ch. 37 v. 19, Ch. 79 v. 6.

Usury forbidden.

Ch. 3 v. 125, Ch. 2 vs. 276-277.

Veil.

Ch. 24 v. 31, Ch. 24 v. 59, Ch. 33 vs. 53, 55, 59 (low veils).

Vow.

Ch. 66 v. 2 (Mahomed released from).

Wall in hell.

Ch. 7 v. 44.

Washings.

Ch. 5 vs. 8-9, Ch. 4 v. 46.

Wine, lots, games of chance forbidden.

Ch. 5 vs. 91-92, Ch. 2 v. 216.

Wine in heaven.

Ch. 47 v. 16, (rivers.of), Ch. 76 vs. 5-6' (allowed
in heaven).

Wives.

Ch. 4 v. 38 (scourge refractory wives), Ch. 4 v. 3
(four allowed), Ch. 4 v. 60 (in heaven), Ch. 33 vs.
49-52 (Mahomed's), Ch. 33 v. 53 (Mahomed's
widows cannot remarry), Ch. 13 v. 23 (in
heaven), Ch. 40 v. 8 do, Ch. 2 v. 223 (your wives
are your field ; go in, therefore, to your field as
ye will"), Ch. 33 v. 33 (Mahomed's wives to
abide in house and not to go out in public
decked).

Women—see Man and Woman.

Works—see Faith.

Zeid's wife.

Ch. 33 vs. 37-38.

ERRATUM.

Page	Line	For	Read
1	2	saving	saying
3	15	Mahomed	Mahomed's
11	7	to fail	fail to
22	9	century	century after
"	10	their	its
37	33	word	word
44	11	tho	the
49	14	82	32
"	24	for	of
60	22	cincerned	concerned
63	7	bigotted	bigoted
65	14	gewish	Jewish
82	20	wills	wills it
83	19	omit haps	
84	27	int	into
"	29	time	times
86	11	angles	angels
89	31	of	of the
91	18	referred	referred to
92	8	the	to
94	13	New	Now
96	19	-found	fond
"	21	principle	principal
"	31	shawn	shows
98	25	deposit	deposit it
103	27	prineipal	principal
126	34	no	so
131	23	know	knew

Page	Line	For	Read
131	24	Charists	Christs
139	5	10010	100-101
141	5	forcs	force
"	26	year	years
151	21	wish	wish to
"	30	ascetism	and asceticism
152	2	lny	fay
158	11	Theodocius	Theodisius
169	6	13th	10th
